

to 3000

WAR, SADISM AND PACIFISM

WAR, SADISM & PACIFISM

THREE ESSAYS

by

EDWARD GLOVER, M.D.

*Director of Scientific Research, London Institute
of Psycho-Analysis*

LONDON

GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD

MUSEUM STREET

FIRST PUBLISHED IN 1933

All rights reserved

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
UNWIN BROTHERS LTD., WOKING

PREFATORY NOTE

IN the summer of 1931 I was invited to lecture at a Summer School of the International Federation of League of Nations Societies at Geneva. The organizer of this School (Captain Lothian Small) felt that it was desirable for students to know just how much light could be thrown on war problems by modern psycho-analytical psychology. And this intention was appropriately reflected in the title he ultimately chose to print in the *Proceedings*, viz. 'Pacifism in the Light of Psycho-analysis.' I was also given the opportunity of expanding my presentation at a subsequent Round Table Discussion. Since then I have lectured on the same subject to a League of Nations Union Easter School at Cambridge, and have submitted my views to various representative pacifists for criticism. The present publication is the outcome of a number of pressing suggestions that, however debatable the issues may appear, they ought to be given a wider publicity than is secured by lecturing to groups of convinced pacifists. I am the more ready to overcome my personal reluctance to rush into print on controversial subjects in that the issues of war and peace seem to have acquired an

increased urgency during the past eighteen months.

I am indebted to Captain Small for permission to reproduce the substance of the original lecture.

EDWARD GLOVER

CONTENTS

| | PAGE |
|--------------------------------|------|
| PREFATORY NOTE | 5 |
| I. WAR, SADISM AND PACIFISM | 11 |
| II. A POSTSCRIPT ON MASOCHISM | 47 |
| III. THE PROBLEM OF PREVENTION | 73 |
| IV. AN OUTLINE OF RESEARCH | 110 |
| INDEX | 145 |

EXCERPT FROM AN OPEN LETTER
WRITTEN BY
FREUD TO EINSTEIN
IN ANSWER TO THE QUESTION:
WHY WAR?

. . . You are interested, I know, in the prevention of War, not in our theories. . . . Yet I would like to dwell a little longer on this Destructive Instinct which is seldom given the attention that its importance warrants. With the least of speculative efforts we are led to conclude that this Instinct functions in every living being, striving to work its ruin and reduce life to its primal state of inert matter. Indeed, it might well be called the "death-instinct"; whereas the Erotic¹ Instincts vouch for the struggle to live on. The death-instinct becomes an impulse to destruction when, with the aid of certain organs, it directs its action outwards, against external objects. The living being, that is to say, defends its own existence by destroying foreign bodies. But in one of its activities, the death instinct is operative *within* the living being and we have sought to trace back a number of normal and pathological phenomena to this *introversion* of the destructive instinct. . . . Obviously when this internal tendency operates on too large a scale, it is no trivial matter, rather a

¹ In the meaning *Plato* gives to *Eros* in his *Symposium*.

positively morbid state of things; whereas the diversion of the destructive impulse towards the external world must have beneficial effects. Here is then the biological justification for all those vile, pernicious propensities which we now are combating. We can but own that they are really more akin to nature than this our stand against them, which, in fact, remains to be accounted for.

‘WHY WAR?’ Albert Einstein—Sigmund Freud. International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation, League of Nations: 1933. Pp. 44-46. (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.)

WAR, SADISM AND PACIFISM

I

WAR, SADISM AND PACIFISM

WHEN a medical psychologist is found wandering in the territories of peace organization, he may fairly be asked why he has crossed the frontier of his own science and whether he can justify his claim to be given a somewhat lengthy hearing. The psychologist for his part is prepared to meet this demand for credentials. He has in fact two sound reasons to advance in proof of bona fides. In the first place, peace propaganda is part of the applied science of sociology and although the psychologist is more accustomed to talk in terms of 'group psychology,' he may reasonably claim that the phenomena of war and the reaction-phenomena of peace come within his province. The second reason is one of legitimate curiosity, an affair one might almost say of medical diagnosis. In the speeches of various exalted personages the activities of the League of Nations are referred to as a crusade, and an ex Prime Minister of Great Britain has said that this crusade must be founded on faith. Now it would appear that the immediate

aim of peace propaganda, the abolition of war, is one that would be accepted by the average thoughtful person without question: yet not only is it necessary for a band of enthusiasts to maintain the most assiduous peace propaganda, but there can be little doubt that the success of their efforts hangs at times in the balance. As the memory of the last great 'war to end war' dims the incentive of common people to prevent the next outbreak loses energy, continuity and direction.

The natural comment would appear to be that the war impulses of the race are responsible for this state of affairs, but to be content with this view is to betray the traditions of scientific method. When an organ is found partly diseased, the physician's task is not merely to diagnose the disease but to discover why the healthy parts of the organ have not succeeded in counterbalancing the disturbance by a hypertrophy of function. Following this plan, we must inquire why the natural post-war incentive to pacifism loses its driving force so quickly and whether there is not some fundamental flaw or intrinsic weakness in the strategy of the peace crusade.

Before embarking on a systematic review of these problems let me offer you, after the manner of patent medicine vendors, a sample conclusion together with a sample illustration of the psycholo-

gist's approach to the subject. A typical conclusion is the following: *a large part of the energy that drives a peace organization has precisely the same source as the energy that lets loose war.* In more technical language, the impulses of aggression towards external persons, if turned in on the self (i.e. short circuited) end by checking the aggression they set out to promote. Now let me add a rider to this proposition. *Owing to the fundamental identity between some of the impulses promoting peace and the impulses giving rise to war, pacifist measures tend to be uncertain in action.* Under conditions of stress, they may even expose their aggressive origin. And now a therapeutic recommendation: *the tendency to instability in peace activities can be overcome most successfully and rapidly by directing attention to the identity of impulses concerned in war and peace.*

As to methods of observation, some are highly technical, others of the most elementary nature. For example, in collecting the psychic reactions of soldiers to war experience, it has been noted that as opposed to situations arousing horror or repugnance, there are many occasions when, given the safety of the observer, a degree of fascination can be detected. Many soldiers have recorded the curious satisfaction evoked by observing a direct hit on some isolated house, when the whole building disappears in a cloud of dust and smoke. But any objective observer of the nursery activi-

ties of children can cap this observation with another. When a child has laboriously and joyfully built a house of bricks, he will frequently scatter it with one sweep of his fist. And the psychologist comparing these observations will suggest that there is a psychic identity between them. He may even be so pessimistic as to say that for peace propaganda to be successful, it must begin like charity at home, i.e. in the nursery. Whether accurate or not, this view is not by any means original. The Battle of Waterloo, it was alleged, was won on the playing-fields of Eton. Psychology is only following this lead by suggesting that it was planned in the nurseries of Corsica.

* * *

The first systematic step in investigating the relations of war and peace is to make a list of the instincts or impulses concerned. Here we encounter two difficulties, first, that there are differences of opinion regarding the classification of human impulses, and second, that the collection of available material has so far been carried out in a very perfunctory way. Now whatever classification you adopt, whether you accept the common tripartite grouping, viz. sexual, self-preservatory and group instincts, or prefer the more elaborate groupings of descriptive

psychology in which a dozen or more instincts may be specified, there is one practical test by means of which all classifications can be valued. It is a sound principle that any impulse, disturbance of which causes mental conflict or disorder, is of extreme significance to the individual. And investigations carried out by psycho-analysts on neuroses and several forms of insanity have shown that behind these illnesses are to be discovered serious disorders of the sexual impulse (taken in the broadest sense) and serious disturbances of the mechanisms controlling aggressive or destructive impulses. These facts correspond with a classification of instincts into two main groups, viz. appetitive and reactive. Broadly speaking, the human mind begins to crack when it is unable in some way or another to master its destructive impulses, its sexual impulses or any important fusion of destructive and sexual impulses.

Adopting this classification, the first step in investigation is comparatively simple: it is obvious that war impulses can be identified with the impulses of destruction. This is, however, a very inadequate view. Study of the history of war necessitates a more comprehensive grouping: according to this the impulses concerned in war are those of destruction (of animate and inanimate objects), acquisitiveness (mostly but not

exclusively directed towards inanimate objects) and sexual aggression (chiefly directed towards animate objects), Murder, Rapine or Pillage, Lust. This too is inadequate. Together with the loosening of primitive impulse goes a heightening of certain counter-reactions, usually extolled as amongst the noble virtues—devotion to ideals, courageous self-sacrifice and comradeship, strenuous feats of intellectual and physical prowess and endurance. And so on. This is better but it is still utterly inadequate. *The fact is that no serious attempt has been made to catalogue and classify the instinctual phenomena of war.* Gifted amateurs have attempted the task but as a rule they start their war novels or autobiography with strong subjective bias, never with completely objective psychological criteria. And here one feels tempted to anticipate a later discussion of practical measures by putting a test question: How many millions are spent by the League of Nations or at the instigation of the League on psychological research into the nature of war impulses? How many psychological institutions are working day and night in different countries to fathom the riddles of human conflict either individual or social?¹

¹ Since writing this I have been sufficiently interested to make some tentative inquiries on the point. With the assistance of Captain Small (International Federation of League

In the absence of broader statistical investigations one is thrown back on more sparse records, i.e. individual examination of combatants, finally on discoveries as to the nature of instinct in infants and primitive savages. Even the most superficial examination of the experience of soldiers shows that in addition to the loosening of destructive impulse in general, *a certain amount of impulse life of a bizarre nature tends to break through under war conditions*. How is one to explain, for example, the impulse of a certain private—in peace time a conventional solicitor—who seized every safe opportunity of slipping over the top in order to draw the teeth of dead enemies lying in No Man's Land? An unusual case admittedly, but evidence that there existed in that person independent drives tending towards violence and mutilation and trophy hunting. There is in fact a psychic identity between his atavistic impulses and the

of Nations Societies) I have ascertained the following curious facts. Not a penny is spent by the League on immediate investigation of war phenomena. And although some international foundations finance general sociological investigations, not one country in the world spends a sou on investigating the psychological phenomena and motivation of war. On the other hand, hundreds of thousands of pounds are available for research on cancer, leprosy, measles, foot and mouth disease, wheat rust, the boll weevil, the death-watch beetle, and sundry vegetable saprophytes. A curious example of the uneven functioning of self-preservative impulse!

ceremonial war activities of head-hunters in Borneo, to say nothing of the one time scalping rituals of American Indians. Pursue this matter of psychic identity and you will arrive at the conclusion that the souvenir collection of *Pickelhauben* has its roots in the same impulses: that when old maids on holiday tear up roots of violets to plant in their front gardens as mementos, there is here too an echo of Saturnalian impulse. However that may be, classification of the available data shows that under war conditions, in addition to the usual laudable impulses permanently sanctioned by society and in addition to the temporarily sanctioned impulses of killing and destruction, one meets with numerous impulses unsanctioned even by the War Office. A first group includes actions or impulses in which the destruction of the enemy as such is less important to the individual soldier than some particularly recondite aim or bizarre variety of destruction (e.g. mutilation): a second includes those destructive activities in which a manifest element of sexual gratification enters (e.g. sexual mutilation): and the third comprises impulses manifestly sexual in nature but of an unusual character (e.g. the so-called sexual perversions). These groupings become all the more significant when we realize that a large part of the child's early energies are devoted to mastering almost identical impulses.

Now there is a point of major importance concerning the development of primitive destructive impulse. It can be shown that whereas on some occasions the impulses of aggression, destruction and mastery can subserve the purposes of self-preservation (as in suckling) and whereas on others they can heighten or advance love interests (as in passionate caressing), in all individuals a stage of development occurs in which the infliction of some sort of pain becomes an aim in itself. *In this respect man is almost unique amongst the animals.* A good deal of confirmation of this fact can be obtained by the study of the sadistic perversions of adults where sexual gratification depends mainly on the infliction of pain on the love object. The 'Ripper' crimes of which so much has been heard recently represent an exaggerated form of this activity. In short, *war provides perhaps the most dramatic piece of evidence that destructive impulses can be completely divorced from biological aims and pursue individual ends.*

It is high time to link up this train of thought with more practical considerations. The problem of war and peace is not a self-contained problem. The pacifist is not concerned merely with the avoidance of situations of war: he has to deal not only with a group of manifest destructive impulses, but with a complex group of 'mixed' impulses of an archaic sort. The majority of these

archaic impulses are no longer manifest in adult life, i.e. they are in the technical sense *unconscious*. And these unconscious impulses exist in a perpetually active state in the mind of *every* individual. For convenience in future reference, we will call the most important mixtures of impulse, viz.: fusion of destructive and love impulses, by the name of sadism when they are directed towards external objects and masochism when they are directed towards the self.¹ A certain amount of sadism may be recognized in consciousness as an element of both sexual and social life, but the most intense sadistic interests remain under ordinary circumstances unconscious. Hence we cannot classify the phenomena of war until we have

¹ As we shall see when examining the nature of Masochism (p. 57), the terms sadism and masochism have acquired a broader meaning in the course of time. They no longer apply solely to the linking of destructive impulse with *manifest* erotic impulse. Some writers indeed have developed the rather slipshod habit of using the term sadism when they mean simply impulses of aggression, mastery and destruction. There is no doubt some justification for this usage because it is rare to find aggressive impulses unmixed with some form of love impulse. But theoretically at any rate it is important to regard the aggressive impulses as having independent origin and to confine the term sadism to those aggressive impulses which are linked *either consciously or unconsciously* with some love component. By so doing the term will be found applicable to the great majority of situations where gratification is obtained from acts of physical or psychical injury, humiliation, etc.

taken an exact measure of the *unconscious* forces of sadism and of the equally *unconscious* methods of mastering, inhibiting, sidetracking, concealing or remaining unaware of these forces.¹

To turn for a moment to peace propaganda. If the conventional solicitor whom I described as a trophy hunter were a Branch Secretary of a

¹ A recent experience has convinced me that one cannot emphasize too frequently or emphatically the fact that these sadistic impulses are for the greatest part *unconscious*. When I submitted these essays for criticism to a prominent English pacifist, he pointed out that the people most responsible for bringing Great Britain into the war showed no sign of sadistic or pugnacious impulse during the crisis. Did not Asquith sit with tears running down his cheeks when he decided that war was inevitable? Was not Grey unable to sleep for about three weeks, going over every step he had taken, considering what mistakes he had made or what he could possibly have done to avoid the disaster? Was it not possible that Bethmann-Hollweg felt much the same?

Precisely! But even if, for the sake of argument, we agree to the very questionable proposition, viz.: that Asquith or Grey were responsible agents rather than puppets manipulated by forces infinitely stronger than themselves, we cannot allow the evidence of sleepless nights or of tears coursing down ageing cheeks to prejudice the observer in favour of conscious motivations. If Asquith, Grey and Bethmann-Hollweg are to be held responsible in this sense we are bound all the more to inquire into their unconscious states of mind before, during and after the crisis, in other words into their general psychic dispositions as well as their conscious attitudes. Unless the reader is prepared to consider the existence of dynamic unconscious forces, the whole argument of these essays must appear so much moonshine.

Peace Organization, would you feel quite easy in your minds as to the reliability or efficiency of his propaganda? Would you like to think of such an individual in a more responsible position as Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, for example, or Ambassador in a foreign capital? Remember that in all probability but for the stimulus of war his sadistic tendencies would have remained unconscious. Indeed, if he is still alive it is quite possible that he has forgotten the whole series of episodes and is now a zealous protagonist of peace. Even so, would you depend on him in a sudden international crisis with the balance swaying between war and peace?

Here we approach the second line of investigation. If you ask why it is that any individual can be unaware of the existence of powerful impulses, the answer is surely that this must be due to an even more powerful controlling mechanism. Repression, to use the technical term, is the greatest and in a limited sense the most secure of all the mechanisms that inhibit instinct. The result of successful repression is that we have not the slightest *idea* of the existence of an impulse and no physical discomfort or mental tension (i.e. *affect*), owing to frustration of the unknown impulse. The description of this mechanism is a

highly technical matter into which I cannot hope to enter here, except to say that it involves withdrawal of psychic energy from a subterranean overcharged psychic circuit together with reinforcement of energy in any circuit of ideas which insulates the danger zone. I will only add that although essentially a system of flight, repression has justified itself biologically as much as, if not more than, any other form of flight from danger. By its help primitive impulse has been sufficiently weakened to permit of the residue being dealt with by what we called civilized reactions. Repression is a gigantic self-deception of which the self is unaware. Biologically speaking, as an analyst once put it, it is the father of lies. But like all mechanisms it is justified only by success. *The dangers of repression are the dangers of unsuccessful repression.* Should the idea representing the impulse *threaten* to break through into consciousness any disaster may follow: the mind, shying from the scent of danger like a frightened horse may stampede or kick the shafts to pieces. Even if the idea is safely locked away, should the tension of an unknown but frustrated impulse be experienced, any disaster may follow, e.g. a vicarious object may be made to function as a lightning conductor. But if the repressed idea can be made conscious and if at the same time the emotional tension can be traced to its source, the individual

and society are safe. For the moment at any rate a breathing-space has been gained and in that breathing-space the processes of conscious reflection and judgment have time to operate.

The phenomena of 'war-mongering' provide an apt illustration of the dangers and uncertainties of faulty repression. In its most official form war-mongering is simply the aggressive aspect of international diplomacy but, of course, it is concealed to a large extent by the manifestly pacific nature of much diplomatic activity. The man in the street has not the same reason to cover his bellicose imaginings. And in the ordinary way preoccupation with international rights and wrongs is a useful substitute activity, a vicarious discharge of emotional tension, the original source of which is infantile sadism. *During actual crises, however, this vicarious discharge may bias the person towards war or peace.* You will observe that we cannot immediately predict in what direction the balance will swing. Knowledge of many other factors is necessary for any such prognostication. The fact remains, however, that the bias is dictated by individual unconscious needs and not by rational considerations of social necessity.

But the danger of unsuccessful repression is not simply that primitive sadism is liable to be

loosened in inappropriate directions. *Faulty repression can itself engender irrational hate.* Experimental proof of this fact can be obtained from the analysis of neurotic individuals. Analyse a neurotic symptom and you discover that huge quantities of anxiety and guilt must be discharged before the symptom disappears. Soon you begin to realize that the symptom represents a spontaneous attempt to master anxiety. In most cases, of course, an unsuccessful attempt. Many neurotic symptoms are in fact called 'anxiety states.' Others again are called 'phobias,' implying that excessive fear has been displaced from an unknown to a known idea or situation (fears of domestic animals, of knives, of being buried alive, of closed spaces, of thunder, and so forth). In both cases repression has been faulty, an affect due to unconscious impulses has penetrated to consciousness, the original idea alone remaining repressed. The most significant observation is however that prior to the discharge of anxiety of unknown origin, an otherwise amiable patient not only develops attitudes of intense hostility and dislike, but *hastens to direct this hostility at the nearest available object.* In most cases it is directed at the analyst, who, whatever his failings, has done nothing to justify this sudden change in personal feeling. Anxiety breeds hate; hate arouses anxiety; both together portend destruction.

Corroborative material is not difficult to collect. Beginning with comparative psychology; it is well known that quite timid animals when driven into a corner will attack in the face of hopeless odds. And now an observation from child psychology; when a child is anxious, it is liable to break into tantrums. A frightened child is an anxious child. A naughty child is a terrified and guilty child. An aggressive and destructive child is panic-stricken with guilt and anxiety. Here we have an illuminating side-light on the problem of hostility. *Not only is hate an indication of aggressive tendencies, it can be used as a protection against inner anxiety.* The child is driven into a corner by an implacable enemy, namely, the intolerable tension of its own primitive urges. These not only cannot be gratified, but feed on frustration; frustration induces anxiety; anxiety is the enemy of peace of mind; hence when breaking-point is reached, the child behaves like a timid animal and bites.

One is tempted to pause here and draw facile parallels from the affairs of nations: to say, for example, that a bellicose nation is an anxious nation, or that the duty of ambassadors stationed in a war-mongering country is to discover and allay all sources of group anxiety in that country. But until the relations of individual to group psychology have been discussed, the temptation

must be put aside. To return to our child who is hunted into a corner by the implacability of his own impulses, it has been said that he will turn and bite. But when he turns there is no enemy to be seen. *The instinctual enemy is internal and unknown.* What then happens is dictated by the logic of events. Experience has taught him that the external world bears hardly on children, that it frustrates, interferes, punishes and generally causes psychic and physical pain. In short, the external world behaves like an enemy. Biassed by this experience the child comes out of his corner and goes hunting. The nearest external object, animate or inanimate, is his quarry: as soon as he sights one, preferably an animate object, he charges like a wounded buffalo. The roars of these panic-stricken creatures are to be heard in the nursery walks of every public park in Europe, and at this moment in Geneva there are doubtless many nurses or parents rubbing their shins or picking up the fragments of broken toys after the heat of battle. Now here we see the climax to what is called a *projection*. Projection implies a psychic displacement; *an attempt to convert an inner (psychic) stimulus into an outer (reality) stimulus, an inner enemy into an outer enemy.* It is one of the oldest of mental mechanisms, it serves a useful purpose in emergencies, but its retention as an adult mechanism is one of the greatest dangers to existing

civilization. *And it operates with especial vigour in most group relations.* When an idea infringes some socially accepted code, it is usually directed outwards in the form of a disparagement. For the conventional Briton, Paris is a 'gay' city, not London; and of course he is not himself 'gay.' During war time this process is even more patent. It is always the enemy who is accused of shelling Red Cross Units or raping in subjugated territories, or castrating and crucifying wounded, or boiling up his own dead for candle grease.

At this point anthropological speculations help to broaden our outlook. Somewhere half-way between nursery wars and the wars of nations come the tribal wars of primitive races. Study of these phenomena goes far to suggest that in the course of human development the element of projection plays a decisive part in the waging of war. To begin with we know from the animistic systems of the savage, that he has peopled the external world with evil spirits, *a projection of the primitive impulses he has such difficulty in mastering:* and he believes himself to be in constant danger of attack from these dangerous and malevolent beings. The little child, of course, does practically the same. We know too that head-hunting activities are essentially ceremonial systems closely connected with the same animistic view of the universe. So it is a short step to suggest that tribal

war in general is not merely an economic or self-preservatory necessity. It serves to divert outward impulses which, left unsatisfied, are potentially sources of familial or tribal disintegration. *We can vaguely apprehend in this externalization of conflict a phase of biological adaptation.* A pessimistic view you will say, but not really so. After all, even if the Chinaman did burn down his house to get roast pig, accumulation of experience and reflection led to more appropriate methods of culinary adaptation.¹

It has been said that projection is an archaic

¹ Volumes could be written on this one aspect of war-problems. Apart from the primitive forms of projection I have described, the mechanism can be traced through various stages of development. For example, in the case of the male child, a final form is concerned almost exclusively with the projection of hostility due to excessive rivalry with other family males (father, brother, etc.). During this period also the boy attempts to deal with his hostility by forging love-bonds with the same family males or their nearest substitutes. Hence in adult society the stability of male groups depends mainly on two factors, (a) sublimated homosexuality (friendship, social ties, etc.) and (b) the capacity to project hostility on less important males. This mixture is essentially unstable or incompatible. The outbreak of war, affording as it does a (socially justifiable) outlet for hostility towards males (the enemy, invaders, etc.), reinforces very strongly the friendly bonds between males in any one country. Nothing unites men so closely as a 'good' war. Pacifists who regard Nationalism as the main cause of war should not overlook these vital sexual factors in nationalist feeling.

type of mental mechanism, that in adult affairs it may be a dangerous mechanism, but that is not all. *Like most emergency mechanisms it is not well adapted to deal with constant pressure of instinct.* A hungry man may begin by assuring his table companions that it is they who are hungry, but if the meal is unduly delayed he is bound to admit in the long run that he is himself hungry. What is more, if he tries to stave off pangs of hunger by eating the table cloth, he will soon perceive some essential lack of gratification. It is true that other impulses (e.g. some forms of love impulse) can be frustrated for a longer period but in the long run some deception or artificial aid is necessary for their control. Repression as we have seen is an improvement on projection but it too has a serious drawback: it is not invariably successful. When these and other primitive mechanisms fail we are faced with an instinctual crisis.

Here we make a discovery of fundamental importance; a discovery that sheds light not only on problems of war and peace, but on the whole process of civilization. *In the face of this instinctual impasse the psychic apparatus grows a new organ.* It accomplishes a masterpiece of adaptation. And it accomplishes this adaptation with the most admirable economy. It uses up the energies which

if left to accumulate, throw a strain on all mental and physical function.

The story is briefly as follows: The newborn child sets out on its endless journey through infancy equipped with primitive love capacities and primitive reactive tendencies (which we may loosely call primitive hates). *Both primitive loves and primitive hates are of their nature destined to perpetual frustration.* After all the infant can neither swallow its mother whole in an access of love, nor tear her to shreds in an access of hate. It is only on battlefields that people can be blown to bits deliberately and with the manifest approval of some of the onlookers. The great majority of the infant's primitive impulses are incapable of satisfaction in reality. The immediate consequences are (a) that the child's relation to the first external objects, the parents, is a mixture of love and hate, and (b) that the unsatisfied and unsatisfiable instinct-drives towards these objects give rise to a dangerous state of explosive tension.

On the other hand, the parents, by reason of their actual protective functions, qualify for love and admiration; and the child gradually learns to model itself both consciously and unconsciously on family patterns. It is not enough to say that the child's mind acquires a permanent stamp: the process can best be described as a kind of psychic swallowing or mental absorption. The

parents are psychically swallowed during life as in certain primitive tribes they are physically swallowed by their children after death. *An active parental institution is thus erected in the child's mind; and this functions in the absence of real parents.* At the same time there is no concealing the fact that the parents do actually frustrate the wishes of the child and are in any case held responsible for every frustration. As has been said the hate engendered by painful frustration is so primitive that it could not be satisfied even if the parents were ready to co-operate in their own destruction, which is far from being the case. This impotent hate is first dealt with by projection. It is projected by the child on to the parents. In consequence the latter are now endowed with more menacing qualities than they actually possess. The infantile edition of primitive animism is produced. The world is full of dangerous parental figures or their substitutes. Still the process of psychic absorption or identification goes on: it is indeed accelerated by frustration. The result now is that there develops in the child's mind alongside of the friendly system of modellings or identifications a more oppressive series. The child psychically swallows bad, menacing parents as well as good. This sinister doppelganger represents the exaggerated (projected) severity of the parents. At this stage the

new parental institution in the child's mind is predominantly unfriendly towards the child's ego.

We have seen that the child's primitive energies directed in vain towards real parental objects are inevitably frustrated and turned back. And this reflux threatens not only stagnation but explosion. When however these good and bad psychic identifications have been set up in the child's mind the excess can be used to some purpose. The friendly modellings absorb hopeless love and sinister modellings employ hopeless hate in a useful way. *Hate-energy is to a large extent used up in self-scrutiny and inhibition.* In short these identifications are built into a new mental system, part of which exercises an aggressive function. It scrutinizes impulse with severity and ends by inhibiting or thwarting from within almost all primitive instinct. *The energy used for this purpose is the individual's primal sadism now inturned.* In other words, this new psychic organ or scrutinizing system (sometimes called the Super-ego or Primitive Unconscious Conscience), uses up a large part though not all of the thwarted aggression.

It is a triumph of adaptation, and the first fruits of the victory are decrease of anxiety, increased capacity to love and increased love reward from

environment. True, the system has drawbacks. Like most primitive adaptations, it tends towards excessive function: it may even go so far as to paralyse instinctual life altogether. But in the main it works. And it works on a principle frequently exploited by both administrators and diplomats, namely, divide and govern. When the primitive ego says, 'slay your enemies,' the unconscious mentor says not only, 'if you do, I shan't love you any more,' but quite uncompromisingly, 'if you slay them, I will slay you.' And the result is inaction. This is probably the situation of the average individual who is not openly bellicose but not active in the promotion of peace. When the unconscious mentor says further 'unless you love your enemies I will slay you,' we are approaching one of the motivations of peace propaganda. I do not say of all peace propaganda, because I cannot pretend to deal with more than a few outstanding factors.

Now I have described this mastering of external aggression by a system of division and distribution through the self as a masterpiece of adaptation. And on the whole the description is just. But given certain unfavourable circumstances the mechanism can be defeated. Suppose, for example, that the ordinary person, not actively warlike but not actively peace-loving, is fired by some ideal, e.g. love of his country. Suppose further that he is

exhorted by the representatives of social law and order to rise in defence of his fatherland, or pursue a crusade, or take part in a 'war to end war,' the chances are that his inhibiting mechanism will give way under the strain of social sanction, and the full sweep of his aggression will once more turn outwards. But not on this occasion towards his old enemies of nursery times; he will now assure us that much as he hates war, he must gird up his loins and go forth to fight the Afghans, or Basutos or Chinese or Dutch or English or French or Germans¹—or whatever appointed object is indicated to him in the first place by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of his own country.²

Now let us suppose that by some means or another he became familiar with his old nursery mechanisms, freed himself from the strain of his undigested and regurgitant sadism, and realized the essential mental pathology of war. It is just conceivable that his behaviour in a crisis would be of a different order. When the pundits of Downing Street and Wilhelmstrasse, the oracles of Turkistan and the medicine men of Fiji solemnly declared that war was inevitable, he would in-

¹ But not, of course, Afghan or Basuto women. Students who proceed on the light-hearted assumption that the problem is essentially an economic or political problem would do well to consider some of the more patently sexual factors in war (see also pp. 29, 38 and 132).

² See also Appendix on research, p. 143.

stantly diagnose the situation, appoint a commission of psychotherapists with full power to clap his own Foreign Secretary into a mental nursing home and get in touch with the Diplomatic Lunacy Commission of the alleged hostile country.

During the recent war the common soldiers of every combatant country had some glimmering of this possibility. But they could not see far enough. They were biassed by their own predilection for settling a dispute by fighting. They used to say in effect: Why not hustle the Kaiser and Sir Edward Grey and Poincaré on to the village green, thrust cudgels in their hands and let them settle the matter by the thickness of their own skulls? You see after all the old zest for cock-fighting had not died out in them. With a little less bias they might have visualized in place of the village green the quiet consulting-room of a sanatorium, in place of the quarter-staves a gentle but persistent mental exploration of the poisoned wells of hidden sadism. But their own fundamental combativeness blinded them to this vision. Nevertheless, they obviously had some glimmering of a profound psychological truth. They realized that a world war is simply an extension of a family affair; that the Kaiser and Sir Edward Grey and Poincaré are merely Tom, Dick and Harry on the village green, or little Tommy, young Master Dick and brother Harry in the

back garden, or three unbaptized turkey cocks swelling their wattles in the nursery.

The issue at stake here is an important psychological issue. Are the impulses of a group capable of classification in terms of individual psychology? There is considerable difference of opinion on the point. Some hold that group impulses belong to a special herd-instinct, others that they are simply displacements from an earlier series of family relations. But it seems to me, speaking for the moment as a partisan, that the application of individual psychology to group manifestations sheds more light on certain social phenomena than does the mere assumption of a herd instinct. For example, it is easy to say that the individual is amenable to exhortation to 'join up' because the Prime Minister or Horatio Bottomley represents the leader of the herd. But the individual psychologist, whilst not denying the importance of the leader as a father or mother substitute, is not satisfied until he has laid bare in the situation of conflict between two countries *all* the threads of infantile conflict. Thus it is impossible to assess the recruiting value of mob-appeals made in the summer of 1914 and afterwards without some understanding of these simple baby phantasies which lie hidden in the 'unconscious' of every

stantly diagnose the situation, appoint a commission of psychotherapists with full power to clap his own Foreign Secretary into a mental nursing home and get in touch with the Diplomatic Lunacy Commission of the alleged hostile country.

During the recent war the common soldiers of every combatant country had some glimmering of this possibility. But they could not see far enough. They were biassed by their own predilection for settling a dispute by fighting. They used to say in effect: Why not hustle the Kaiser and Sir Edward Grey and Poincaré on to the village green, thrust cudgels in their hands and let them settle the matter by the thickness of their own skulls? You see after all the old zest for cock-fighting had not died out in them. With a little less bias they might have visualized in place of the village green the quiet consulting-room of a sanatorium, in place of the quarter-staves a gentle but persistent mental exploration of the poisoned wells of hidden sadism. But their own fundamental combativeness blinded them to this vision. Nevertheless, they obviously had some glimmering of a profound psychological truth. They realized that a world war is simply an extension of a family affair; that the Kaiser and Sir Edward Grey and Poincaré are merely Tom, Dick and Harry on the village green, or little Tommy, young Master Dick and brother Harry in the

back garden, or three unbaptized turkey cocks swelling their wattles in the nursery.

The issue at stake here is an important psychological issue. Are the impulses of a group capable of classification in terms of individual psychology? There is considerable difference of opinion on the point. Some hold that group impulses belong to a special herd-instinct, others that they are simply displacements from an earlier series of family relations. But it seems to me, speaking for the moment as a partisan, that the application of individual psychology to group manifestations sheds more light on certain social phenomena than does the mere assumption of a herd instinct. For example, it is easy to say that the individual is amenable to exhortation to 'join up' because the Prime Minister or Horatio Bottomley represents the leader of the herd. But the individual psychologist, whilst not denying the importance of the leader as a father or mother substitute, is not satisfied until he has laid bare in the situation of conflict between two countries *all* the threads of infantile conflict. Thus it is impossible to assess the recruiting value of mob-appeals made in the summer of 1914 and afterwards without some understanding of these simple baby phantasies which lie hidden in the 'unconscious' of every

human being. Tearing up 'scraps of paper,' 'violating' an 'innocent little country,' defending the 'mother' country, however much they may refer to current realities are but echoes of baby phantasies in which the 'good' mother or child is defended against the sinister (mostly sexual) designs of the phantasied 'bad' father. Actually this is a comparatively 'tame' unconscious phantasy of a three-year-old, but it will serve to point a general conclusion, viz.: that *if the individual psychic situation were not already well prepared and all the unconscious justifications for war established, the factor of leadership would not of itself prove decisive.*¹ It is a well-known fact that even persons who can be hypnotized with ease may remain refractory to any hypnotic suggestion of an anti-social nature. Natural as the tendency may be, any attempt on the part of the man in the street to foist sole responsibility for war on the Ruling Powers is a piece of unconscious hypocrisy. It is a tendency exploited in a more crass manner by certain neurotic types who preserve a rankling hatred for their parents on the ground that the latter 'were to blame' for all their misfortunes.

Even so, the individual psychologist believes that if we regard the spell of leadership as the result, not so much of an uncharted herd instinct but as the repetition of an old emotional state of

¹ See footnote, p. 21.

rapprochement between the helpless infant and its all-powerful parents, we cannot only begin to understand war-fevers and maffickings, but begin to consider possible lines of war prevention. Already the social sense of the community has led to some practical steps in the proper direction. It is no longer likely in a democratic country that the offices of state can be held by any manifestly insane person. And it requires only a little imagination to foresee a time when the presence in office of any pathological character type or manifest neurotic or even borderline lunatic¹ will be considered as dangerous to the community as a typhoid carrier or cholera suspect in a dairy farm. Consider the happy-go-lucky methods of political advancement. Any megalomaniac who is not openly certifiable, but whose eccentricity and ego-centricity have left a trail of destruction from the nursery floor to the hustings may, for all we know to the contrary, be firmly established as Secretary for the Admiralty, at a time when graver heads are at their wits' end to tackle some international complication. As the late C. E. Montague said at the close of one of his *ex-parte* peace tracts: 'we must beware in good time of these young boys, and fiery elderly men piping in Thessaly.'

¹ A borderline lunatic is more likely to go undetected than a manifestly neurotic person.

Yet even in the circles of peace the tradition dies hard. How many reformed hotheads have been elected representatives to the Council of the League of Nations? This surely is a matter that merits investigation. So crude indeed are the methods of choosing representatives that even the haphazard and fallible laws of physiognomy would be a better guide. Not to put too fine a point on it, if no psychological means of investigation were possible, I would rather have a war conference from which all turkey-cock types were excluded and a peace conference purged of all lean-jowled enthusiasts with dilated pupils, than groups chosen by political administrations.

For it has to be remembered that the peace fanatic too is a danger to peace. It was one of the lessons of the late war that when a minister who had fought for peace put his hand to the sword, he became with the sincerest intentions the most resolute and implacable enemy. Sir Edward Grey is alleged to have said on August 3, 1914, when his efforts to maintain peace were finally frustrated, 'Yes, we must now be grim.' The lesson is an old one. Given the opportunity the temperance reformer seeks to rule with a rod of iron, i.e. intemperately. Some countries punish crimes of personal violence by even more violent and infinitely more deliberate flogging. The Inquisition burned and tortured in the name of God. It is an

old lesson seldom learned. All that psychology has done is to uncover the mechanism involved. The peace fanatic, by which I do not mean a peaceable person or indeed a peace seeker, defends himself against a strong unconscious sadistic interest by means of a violent conscious counter-interest: and the result is precarious. Tip the balance with a moral conviction of the justness of his cause and heads may fall in the basket to satisfy his arrears of frustration. There is, doubtless, a place for the fanatic: he may usefully employ his fevered energies in stirring the consciences of more lethargic mortals. But he should rarely be allowed the freedom of the executive Council Chamber.

A few moments ago I made the fantastic suggestion that barring other methods of approach one might exclude psychopathic types from office by a crude sort of examination. And it is true that following the example of most Public Services, we could with advantage apply some elementary precautions of this sort. But it has to be admitted that there is no security in a system of exclusion. To put it crudely, so long as the humblest civil servant is an unconscious sadist or suffers from unconscious guilt, the country is not safe from war. The strength of any peace move-

ment is the strength of its weakest link. In any case it would be a retrograde step to depend exclusively on measures of inhibition. Modern psychological research has shown that the only radical method of dealing with a difficulty is complete investigation, not increased inhibition. If you imprison a kleptomaniac you have lost an opportunity of discovering what kleptomania really is. But if you talk to the kleptomaniac and investigate his case fully, you will find to your surprise that the secret of his condition is infantile anxiety and remorse. You will be still more astonished to discover that whilst you are investigating his state, the maniac is mastering his mania. *Solvitur comprehendendo*. A motto that might well serve the purpose of peace organizations. Bias in favour of peace by inhibition—by making pacts, treaties, disarmament agreements or by establishing international sanctions—is natural, but it puts the cart before the horse. It is the dynamic impulse that matters, not the technique or mode of gratifying the impulse. Provided you have no active impulse, the concrete means of gratification, one might say the weapons of gratification, can be quite safely used as parlour ornaments. And in fact after wars are ended many combatant countries proceed to cumber their public parks with the more elephantine instruments of battle. Trophy worship admittedly: but

also a sign that the storm of primitive impulse has for the time being blown over.

To those who have the strength of their psychological convictions, *the first effective step towards abolishing war must be the most complete investigation and individual understanding of the nature of sadistic impulses, their original form, strength and depth, the history of their modification and inhibition. This will entail equally complete understanding of the defence-mechanisms whereby we succeed in remaining unaware of our sadistic urges.*

* * *

I have endeavoured to give a rough outline of the most important *primary* defences responsible for the uncertainty of peace operations, and must content myself here with a single example of *secondary* defence, one which nevertheless acts as a perpetual stumbling-block to objective investigation.

Man has exploited rational processes of thought to such a remarkable extent that it is only natural to believe they can never be used for irrational ends. Yet a considerable amount of rational thinking is used precisely for this purpose. On an enormous number of occasions we argue and formulate and discuss our own motivations, for no other purpose than to obscure a primitive urge which may have been incompletely hidden by more automatic defence mechanisms. This veneer-

ing process goes by the name of rationalization. Perhaps the most remarkable example of twentieth-century rationalization became current during the autumn of 1914, viz. that the European War was a 'war to end war.'

So when we begin the huge task of tracing human sadism, we must be prepared to resist any attempts to sidetrack essential data on whatever plea. Thus when we start by including the pop-gun activities of children, the field sports of grown-ups, the chess or bridge of social clubs, the debates and arguments of dialectic societies, or the internecine wars of aesthetic schools, we must be ready to ignore the rational protests of lovers of competitive sport. When we trace the history of human punishment from the first sharp looks, words, or blows dealt out in the nursery, down to the flogging and pillories of English public schools and prisons, or the tortures legally sanctioned in China, or the sanctified cannibalism of primitive tribes, we must resist all sociological argumentation which would divorce such phenomena from the phenomena of war. And when we inquire into the history of masochism, into the ascetic practices of religious sects in all countries, into the spirit animating reform propaganda of whatever sort, we must not be intimidated either by the indignant protests or by the reasoned objections of those who would

say: this or that has nothing to do with war. Only when the results of such psychological surveys are as familiar to us as our own shadows may we hope to proceed with the more difficult task of estimating our own individual sadistic charges. And only when we can measure our own charges of aggression and defensive hate can we expect the problem of war to become a mere academic or scientific issue.

In short, *it is difficult to escape the conclusion that there is a fundamental flaw in the technique of peace propaganda: or at the least a vital misdirection of energy.* For all practical purposes the supporters of peace can be classified in two groups. There are those who, no matter how much they may appeal to economic arguments, are driven by motives of an ethical nature. In the last resort they may be said to fall back on categorical imperatives of the type familiar to us in the Ten Commandments. There are others again who, despite some degree of lip service to ethics, are driven by some inner reaction to the phenomena of waste and destruction. For them the ethical absolute has become an economic aphorism: it does not pay to kill. To one war is anathema: for the other war is an irritating orgy of disintegration. A third and completely different approach is the approach through medical psychology: war is a manifestation of conflict between human impulses, an

attempt to solve some difficulty, some problem. A mass insanity if you like, provided you remember that insanity is simply a dramatic attempt to deal with individual conflict, *a curative process* initiated in the hope of preventing disruption, but *ending in hopeless disintegration*.

In the view of the medical psychologist, any attempt to fix attention on ethical and economic considerations to the neglect of deeper psychological factors is not only a misdirection of energy but an obstacle to any real progress. If the psychologist were sufficiently ill-advised to propound a proverbial philosophy he would doubtless be tempted to some such formulations as these: if you would avoid war prepare for peace: peace has its strains no less intense than war: take care of your own aggression and the aggression of nations will take care of itself. And if he were compelled to crystallize in one formulation the experience of applied individual psychology, to suggest in a phrase what panacea psychology has to offer a war-ridden species, it would probably take the form of a new sixth commandment: *Know thine own (unconscious) sadism*.

II

A POSTSCRIPT ON MASOCHISM

A POLYTECHNIC chemistry professor lecturing on the complex structure of an apparently simple substance is concerned primarily with the need for effective exposition. Provided his hearers can understand him, he need not stop to inquire whether in the process any of them have been overcome with scepticism or nauseated, or inspired with religious enthusiasm. When, for example, the sophisticated first-year student is informed that common salt is compounded of solid sodium and chlorine gas, it is extremely improbable that he will even gape, much less rise to protest that it is an infamous lie. Quite otherwise with lectures on 'unconscious' psychology. No sooner does the professional exponent pass from a general description of unconscious mental structure to specify unconscious content (as for example highly charged sadistic phantasies) than many of his hearers get into a state either of irritated objection or of overwarm acquiescence. In other words, a lecture on the 'unconscious' is to some extent a psychological blow; aimed primarily at the intellect it almost invariably lands 'low' in the emotions.

It is therefore a specially instructive experiment to live under 'Summer School' conditions and observe personally the delayed reaction to an 'unconscious' lecture stimulus. The substance of the previous chapter was given as a lecture to a League of Nations International Summer School in Geneva. The audience was a typical cultivated post-graduate audience with, one may assume, conscious interest in the abolition of war and in the foundation of permanent peace relations between nations. One may assume further a certain amount of conscious goodwill (receptivity) towards the ideas advanced during the lecture courses. To this essentially pacifist audience I had enunciated certain subversive doctrines. Taking the bull by the horns I had declared that they were wasting a good deal of their energies; that if they wanted to promote peace they should start by searching their own hearts. And knowing that from the conscious point of view their hearts would, on inspection, be found bubbling over with good intentions, I had described the part played universally by primitive sadism in the regulation of unconscious affairs.

The immediate result was apparently as satisfactory as one could wish. Take an audience of young enthusiastic reformers, slightly exalted by the stimulus of foreign travel, pack them one bright sunny morning into an academic class room

within a stone's throw of the Lake of Geneva, treat them with the most subversive of ideas and what is the response? Like the wily iguana of the poem who ended a mortal combat by swallowing his opponent whole, a great number of these guileless tacticians swallowed the argument, lock, stock and barrel. This sudden and successful application of a defensive manoeuvre is always liable to take one's breath away. One talks of forces dynamic enough to make or wreck civilization and the nearest human containers of these catastrophic forces murmur applause!

But within a few days I had an opportunity of observing the backward swing of the pendulum or, to keep to the metaphor, the rapid disgorgement of almost completely undigested ideas. The occasion was a lecture by an economist of international repute. With the assistance of a lantern-screen and some ingeniously contrived slides, he proceeded to uncover dispassionately not simply the economic advantage and disadvantages of war policy but the economic factors which when cumbered by nationalist restrictions prepare the ground for the outbreak of war. So convincing and realistic an approach sapped the confidence of my psychological proselytes. With an embarrassed air of apologetic conflict one of the students buttonholed me afterwards: Was it not possible I had exaggerated the psychological factor? Might

it not be simply a primitive unconscious contribution which when added to more important and realistic self-preservative or predatory impulses gave rise to a slight degree of bias in favour of war? Was there not in this subsequent lecture a complete justification for the concentration of energy on international economic factors?

The suggestion that self-preservative impulses can be saddled with the greater part of war responsibility is simple and appealing. By contrast with the unconscious motivations described in the foregoing chapter it is almost praiseworthy. It is, however, one of those alluring suggestions which are effective only so long as they are not examined too closely. Admittedly it would be inconsistent to suggest at one moment that impulse is a dynamic factor in war and then to deny the importance of self-preservative impulses; all the more so that we have described hostility as to some extent a reaction to real or imagined danger. But to advance self-preservative impulses as the sole or major factor in war immediately involves us in difficulties. If it can be shown not only that economic (self-preservative) factors are liable to lead to war, but that war, despite some possible immediate advantages leads to economic disaster all round, then some other important factor is necessary to explain why any country should cut off its own nose to spite its face. In any case the

more we examine the concept of self-preservative impulse, the more obvious it becomes that even if this impulse is primary and unmixed—which is by no means certain—it functions in a remarkably uneven way. It should be easy to adduce examples of this faulty function of the self-preservative impulses,¹ but it is perhaps simpler to begin by considering the meaning of the phrase used above: to cut off one's nose to spite one's face. Put in more technical terms, this implies that however unreasonable it may seem to the onlooker a certain intensity of hate, sadism and aggression can be satisfied by self-injury. When the onlooker protests that such conduct is unreasonable, he is biased by his own trust (or distrust) in his own self-preservative impulses. In the case of persons ready to mutilate their own noses, these impulses are obviously in a state of partial suspense.

With these reflections in mind the only reply I could offer my summer student was in effect an apology. I had to admit that after all my presentation of the psychological aspects of war was much too one-sided; that too much space had been devoted to the history of unconscious sadism, to the neglect of a group of apparently antithetical factors. Short of reconstructing the whole presentation the only remedy was and is to add a

¹ See, for example, footnote Chapter I, p. 16.

postscript on the history of masochism, on the aggressive function of self-injury and on self-punishment.

The most convenient starting-point for an investigation of masochism is—as the name itself suggests—a study of the common masochistic sexual perversions. Although the exact incidence of these perversions has never been accurately estimated, their main clinical features and variations have been established. These are described in numerous textbooks on the subject. In a typical masochistic perversion the main condition of sexual gratification is that the love-object should inflict on the subject a degree of physical or psychic pain or injury, i.e. the love impulse has become fused with a markedly aggressive component. Having established this definition it is difficult to exclude from the masochistic group individuals who obtain sexual gratification by inflicting a degree of psychic or physical pain *on themselves*. The difference is that in the second case there is apparently only one person involved: the state is reflexive rather than passive. But if sexual self-flagellation is masochistic, how are we to define ritual self-flagellation which is not associated with conscious sexual need or gratification? ‘Conscious’ psychology points here to one con-

clusion. Since these ostensibly religious practices are regarded as expiatory, mortifying or punitive in nature, it may be inferred that self-punishment and masochism have at least one element in common, viz. self-injury.

Having formed this conclusion, the 'conscious' psychologist is bound to examine all available behaviouristic and introspective data. In so doing he will discover that from infancy to old age an infinite number of masochistic, self-injuring and expiatory mechanisms are in constant operation. In the infant he will observe not only manifest erotic practices involving a technique of pain-infliction either by the self or by an external object, but a number of curious self-injuring habits (head bangings, etc.), which are frequently but erroneously regarded as accidental. On the way to adolescent and adult investigation, he will doubtless pause to consider the significance of child suicide. In adolescent and adult fields, he will soon be overwhelmed by a mass of observations, all going to show that apart from sexual masochism, degrees of psychic or physical injury (either reflexive or passive) are a constant feature of human life. He can begin if he likes with a study of apparently awkward or absent-minded individuals who constantly endure minor injuries. Or he can start with more dramatic manifestations, the suicide rate, the 'avoidable

mortality' rate, the 'careless accident' rate, and so forth. Soon he will be compelled to pay attention to individuals who appear to live under conditions of constant psychic humiliation and misery: to those who constantly lose or squander their money with all the usual disagreeable consequences of this manoeuvre: to those whose marriage becomes and remains a form of torture: to the miserable army of melancholiacs who devote their lives to self-humiliation and often inflict on themselves the penalty of death: to their even more numerous camp followers—the social Gummidges who combine a constant appearance of martyrdom with a comparatively good digestion, to say nothing of the martyrdom they inflict on their friends and relations.

Stimulated by these last psychopathological observations he may study the unestimated but certainly enormous incidence of psycho-neuroses, only to discover that self-punishment of one sort or another is an invariable characteristic of these maladaptations. He may even, undeterred by religious, ethical or social sanctions, consider the associated phenomena of penance, philanthropy and altruism. But whichever way he looks he is bound to arrive at the conclusion, that *however strong the egoistic self-preservative impulses may appear, they are to some extent nullified by opposing impulses*. He may even suspect that these opposing

impulses can serve as a check on the more aggrandizing forms of self-preservation, in other words that they can perform a constabular or inhibitory function the destructive element of which at times quite obviously outruns the constable, and ends in injury of the self.

But beyond formulating these general conclusions, and possibly suggesting that the original narrow adult sexual connotation of the word masochism may be much too narrow, the 'conscious' psychologist has little to say of an enlightening nature. Indeed until the discovery of unconscious mental systems and content, the academic psychologist not without a certain amount of relief simply turned his back on the whole problem. We are therefore justified in calling in the 'psychologist of the unconscious' to continue the thread. For convenience in presentation we may consider the contributions of psychoanalysis to this subject under three headings.

(a) MASOCHISM.—The first discoveries were in part phenomenological and in part the result of analysis. It was shown that the adult perversion was merely one manifestation of a universal tendency, that the early instincts of *every* child included a component of 'erotogenic' masochism (meaning that the gratification of this component

had some erotic pleasure tone). The next discovery was that in the building up of an erotogenic masochistic system, the element of erotogenic sadism played its part. A sadistic impulse turned towards an object, when so modified that the object is induced to behave sadistically towards the subject, constitutes in fact a masochistic situation. And it was assumed and confirmed by observation that a transitional form existed when the child behaved sadistically to itself, a reflexive form of sado-masochism.

These rather confusing discoveries were made more comprehensible some years later. As the result of further research into the problem of instinct, the conclusion was arrived at that every child starts out with both destructive and love impulses. It is probable that from the very beginning these impulses exist in varying degrees of fusion. A certain amount of fused impulse (destructive and erotic) is turned outwards towards objects. That is *true primary sadism*. A certain amount of fused impulse remains bound in the individual. That is *true primary masochism*. Now it will be readily understood that the amount of sadistic gratification permitted the small child is minimal. Hence whatever degree of primary sadism cannot be gratified 'without' must seek to be bound 'within,' i.e. on the self. Therefore sadism when frustrated and turned back tends to reinforce

masochism. This additional contribution to masochism is called *secondary masochism*.

(b) SELF-PUNISHMENT AND UNCONSCIOUS 'NEED FOR PUNISHMENT.'—In the course of ordinary phenomenological work, psycho-analysts showed that self-injury mechanisms in some form were universal. Examination of unconscious motivations resulted in two significant discoveries. *In the first place these self-injuries are a form of self-punishment.* In other words *a form of 'unconscious' guilt exists in all individuals* which for practical purposes can be called the *'need for punishment.'* The second point was that *although in conscious levels this self-injury apparently loses its connection with an erotogenic sado-masochism, the connection still exists in the unconscious.* An important conclusion: because it means that self-injury or punishment can be strongly reinforced by unconscious drives toward erotic masochistic satisfaction. The same findings were discovered to be valid for situations where the individual is injured or humiliated *by others.* Although there is no conscious element of sexual experience, this situation remains unconsciously a true masochistic one. And it satisfies the *'unconscious need for punishment by others.'* Applying these findings to conscious psychology it was considered justifiable to broaden the term masochism. The person who is apparently injured by circumstances or who gets into constant hot water is no longer

regarded as a victim of circumstances or as dogged by Fate: unless he can bring convincing proof of the accidental and unavoidable nature of the injuries he is regarded as a '*moral masochist*.'¹

(c) UNCONSCIOUS SPLITTING OF THE PERSONALITY (IDENTIFICATION) AND THE DISTRIBUTION AND CONTROL OF SADO-MASOCHISTIC ENERGIES.—A general outline of these processes and mechanisms has already been given in the first chapter,² but a few words of recapitulation and elaboration may help to draw the various threads together. It has been described how owing to the inevitable frustration of early hate and love, an infantile instinctual crisis is precipitated: how at the same time the child builds up psychic systems based on real and imaginary relations to real and imaginary parents. The imaginary elements, particularly the sinister imaginings about 'dangerous' parents, are contributed by the projection on the parents of the child's frustrated instinct, particularly frustrated destructive and sadistic instinct. The child then builds up a composite psychic system, partly good and worthy of love, partly bad and hating. The good part absorbs frustrated love; the hating part absorbs frustrated sadism. This psychic system by scrutinizing and inhibiting primitive impulse permits the absorption of surplus (frustrated) love and

¹ See footnote, p. 20.

² See pp. 31-33.

hate. If primitive impulse is inhibited after scrutiny, a part of the ego is 'being good' and can be loved by the other part. On the other hand the activity of scrutinizing and inhibiting uses up some of the severity of the hating part.

Now to round off the story. *The states of tension which exist between these mental systems*, these good and bad parts of the mind, these scrutinizing and scrutinized elements, these hating and hated psychic institutions, *give rise to the unconscious guilt which has been described as 'need for punishment.'* Secondly, the sadism turned back from objects not only reinforces the severity (sadism) of the scrutinizing part, it reinforces the readiness for punishment (masochism) of the scrutinized part. When most of the reflected sadism is poured into the scrutinizing institution, the result is an over-inhibited individual: when most of the reflected sadism reinforces the masochism of the scrutinized part, the result is a moral masochist. And a moral masochist although apparently free and active in many respects may be depended on to turn the cheek to misfortune, even if this manœuvre necessitates joining the Foreign Legion.

Applying these formulations to the problems of war and pacifism we are once more confronted with the difficulty described in the first chapter:

Are the findings of individual psychology applicable to group situations? And as before I shall adopt the partisan view that they are applicable. In the meantime it would be politic to deal with less controversial aspects and indicate what part masochistic factors play in individual problems, e.g. the problem of the pacifist or professional soldier or recruited civilian.

We have seen that the unconscious sadism of the pacifist is absorbed by the activity of his unconscious conscience. This implacable instrument points sternly in the direction of 'peace'; hence the maintenance of pacifist activities is to some extent a guarantee of 'peace of mind.' Naturally he too gets some outlet for a modified type of aggression, as in the vigour of his propaganda or strength of his hostility to war and war-mongering. The professional soldier using the same energies and faculties has arrived at a different solution of his problems. The 'private' for example, fortified by a series of real and symbolic sanctions granted by the King, His Ministers, His Lords and Commons, His Army Acts, His Commissioned Officers and their substitutes down to the Lance-corporal has at the same time fortified and justified the sadism of his unconscious mentor or super-ego. Like the butcher and the hangman he seeks a professional outlet for his destructive tendencies, secure in

the conviction that he is only doing his duty, i.e. serving or preserving his King and Country. And in return his sadism is licensed by the War Office. He receives a Baccalaureate from the Royal College of Soldiers and Sailors with the condition attached that he must not practice except under Martial Law. Incidentally we may note that a somewhat similar argument could be advanced by the surgeon, the chiropodist, and, although sometimes with less justification, by the barber.

With the civilian recruit the psychic situation is otherwise. As a pre-war civilian he is something of a dark horse. Assuredly he has the same instincts to contend with and the same mechanisms for defending against them. But he has not adopted the ingenious device unconsciously favoured by both pacifist and regular soldier; *he does not make a profession of his instinctual defence systems*. For this reason and also because of the vast numerical superiority of the group, we may select the 'undeclared' type in order to study the influence of unconscious masochism. At the same time one must admit that within the compass of a short essay it is impossible to do justice to the multiplicity of types such a group is bound to include.

It has been said that in regard to war interests the average civilian is a dark horse. But of course

a preliminary inspection of his accessible mental content might give us some clues. And here we find that many of our social and ethical conventions and restrictions, however useful they may be in other directions, almost completely vitiate the results of any such inspection. The ordinary individual under ordinary circumstances refuses point blank to reveal his innermost conscious thoughts. Even under the average experimental conditions (such as filling in a psychological questionnaire) he is inclined either consciously to lie and prevaricate or unconsciously to forget (which is the unconscious form of lying). Nevertheless we may be certain that a survey of the conscious content of reasonably objective witnesses would enable us to separate out various sub-groups. We would doubtless distinguish those bluff downright types who behind a respectable façade preserve the attitude of the Jingoistic schoolboy to the propaganda of the Navy League. Proud of the expansive area of red splotches representing the British Empire and annoyed by the size of the battleships representing the naval strength of the Other Powers, he makes no bones of a few phantasies of war and annexation. When the Great War was over nothing would satisfy him short of the occupation of Berlin, and the wholesale cession of territory to the victors. At the very least, he argued, France should hold to the left bank of

the Rhine in perpetuity. At the other end of the series we would find types who on the basis of some cast-iron principle are ready to become the conscientious objectors of the next war: or again, those who favour a policy of passive non-resistance, believing that the only way to defeat aggression is to permit the aggressing armies to reach their military objective without firing a shot even if this involves a prolonged foreign occupation.

But soon we would exhaust the sub-groups of those who *conceal* from the world a well-defined conscious attitude to war and pacifism. *Others apparently have no opinions on these matters at all.* Their apparent neutrality is the end result of a special defence; and naturally in times of peace the defence works. Study their attitudes in other matters however and we may hazard a guess as to their tendencies in a war crisis. Individuals who suffer from what the Germans call *schadenfreude*—a tendency to gloat in secret over the misfortunes of others—very often of people to whom they are attached and to whom they may *behave* quite irreproachably—will be liable to thrill with satisfaction when they read of the Sino-Japanese War. That Shanghai or Jehol should be devastated or run with blood does not inhibit the interest: on the contrary these possibilities act as specific stimuli. On the other hand

individuals who are so sensitive to ideas of injury that they would not 'hurt a fly,' or who are inclined to impoverish their resources by compulsive and indiscriminate 'giving,' who cannot pass a beggar in the street without a propitiatory offering of alms, seems likely to read of Manchurian bloodshed with a sense of pity or horror. Follow up these contrasting tendencies and we will soon be busy distinguishing deaf people who always use their deafness in an offensive way, from less sadistic sufferers, who merely pester their friends with their infirmity, or again from the masochistic deaf who make no effort to compensate reasonably for their deficiency but sink back into egotistic martyrdom.

In studying and differentiating these types we find that even consciously it is easier to recognize the sadist than the masochist, *and we suspect that the apparently completely neutral person is possibly an unconscious sado-masochist.* This enables us to formulate one general principle concerning the effect of unconscious masochism, viz.: that in addition to making any situation in which the self may be injured (in this case, war) more attractive, its effect is to obscure the existence of positive sadism. The unconscious masochist is indeed one of the darkest of horses.

Perhaps the most striking illustration of the confusion introduced by this factor is the case of

the ordinary man who without any warning commits suicide. His friends know of no reason for this action, his affairs are in good order, no observable change has occurred in his emotional milieu, his doctor testifies that he was in good health and without any obvious signs of melancholia. So the coroner directs that a verdict should be brought in of suicide 'during temporary insanity.' But anyone who has analysed a suicidal type knows that behind the apparently solid crust of normality a splitting of personality takes place which goes down into the very roots of mental life. It is as if two persons both white hot with rage were engaged in a silent struggle with the energies so equally balanced that no movement could be detected. Reinforce the sadism of one of the unconscious combatants and the resulting advantage in battle is apparent to the onlooker as a bad fit of depression or melancholia. Reinforce suddenly the masochism of the other unconscious combatant and next day we read in our newspaper that someone has 'committed suicide.'

To repeat this in more technical language: the primitive and mostly unconscious ego drawing energies from a reservoir of primitive impulse is held in check by the primitive super-ego or Primitive Unconscious Conscience, which although modelled on real and imaginary

parental patterns, nevertheless *draws its energies* from the *same* inner reservoir. Any sudden freeing of destructive energies which at the same time reinforces the sadism of one component and the masochism of the other ends in death. *From this point of view a system which brings real external objects into the quarrel is in a sense an advance.* To have a real external enemy to attack or to have an external enemy whose attacks can conceivably be defended against successfully is a tempting solution. Suicide as well as being a self-punishment by death, is a murder in self-defence, a murder of an internal enemy: it is also at the deepest masochistic level an erotic (love) gratification. *A situation of war brings the external world into an internal conflict.* Under war conditions external enemies can be punished, they can be murdered in self-defence: on the other hand the punishment (murder) of the self by the enemy is not inevitable. One may merely be mutilated, possibly go scot-free. Moreover one's friends or fellow soldiers can be murdered, mutilated or at any rate 'put through it,' by the enemy, always a tempting solution for those whose unconscious attitudes to their friends is tinged with sadism. All these unconscious situations are at the same time bound together and compensated for by possibilities of love display. In general this takes the sublimated form of love of King, Home,

Country and Ideals, or again of friendly, helpful and self-sacrificing association with one's Brothers in Arms: but the more primitive aspects of camp life are in many cases not without their attraction. Thus even in its reinforcement of more positive and friendly aspects of life, war puts a premium on masochism. The line between conscious altruism and what has been called 'moral masochism' is hard to draw.

In these formulations we have once again passed from the individual to the group aspects of masochism. As I have said this is a controversial subject, hence any opinions I express must be regarded as *ex parte*. I shall content myself with stating that the individual mechanisms I have described are responsible for (or adequately account for) most of the group phenomena. Admittedly they tend to operate in a cruder way in the groups. Whether this is due solely to the factor of reinforcement or not, group manifestations have a more dramatic quality than most individual manifestations. The charge of the Light Brigade is still a legend to those who have long forgotten the exploit of Findlater at Dargai. With regard to those elements which appear to be more specially of a group nature, viz. the welding of individual impulses in a common

group aim or under a common leader or ideal, it can only be said that the origin of such elements must be considered first and foremost from an infantile angle, i.e. from the point of view of the Infantile Family Group. And here again we have to note that at every stage of the formation and disintegration of the Infantile Family Group the element of masochism plays a part complementary to that of sadism. In one sense of course there is no such thing as individual psychology, and obviously the youngest infant is but one of a group of two—mother and child. The youngest children who have been analysed up to now all showed without exception a splitting of their mind into at least two parts, a 'mother-part' and a 'self-part.' By the time this smallest group is extended to include other family figures (Father, Brother, Sister) infantile conflict over primitive impulse has reached its height. Later post-infantile (school, adolescent or adult) group formations, no matter how simple or elaborate their organization, are, from the point of view of primitive impulse, extensions of those earlier infantile groups. *Whatever problems in unconscious masochism have been left unsolved in these earliest phases can be worked over again and again in the playgrounds of later mental life.* The unconscious mind is not primarily concerned with end products: its immediate concern is with relief of tension at

whatever cost and by whatever means. Its masochistic trends can be represented as well by defeat at the hands of a friend on the village bowling green, as by a dream of being shelled from the opposite bank of a river or by actually volunteering for the losing side in a Great War. Left to itself Consciousness has little or no say which path will ultimately be chosen.

Allowing for many errors of omission, the foregoing argument is the psycho-analyst's reply to those who justify a *concentration* of pacifist energies on economic (self-preservative) factors. The trouble about self-preservative impulses is that neither in the individual nor in the group can they be depended upon to perform their function. And this apart altogether from the fact that under certain circumstances group necessity may as the conscript knows to his cost allow no room at all for the expansion of individual self-preservation. An important cause of faulty function is in most instances reinforcement of unconscious masochism. However much you may preach to nationalists that it does not pay to cut off one's nose to spite someone else's face, the lesson cannot be learned so long as unconscious masochism remains an unknown and unmeasured quantity.

In formulating these conclusions I have abstained from using data which cannot be confirmed by anyone using adequate methods of direct investigation. Naturally in conjecturing the immediate post-natal states of infantile mental life we must employ certain working hypotheses, but otherwise the argument is based on established fact. It is only fair to say, however, that much evidence of an extremely suggestive kind can be gathered from indirect sources. In particular the modern school of psycho-analytical anthropology has done sound pioneer work in tracing the ramifications of human guilt and sado-masochism. Starting with the most primitive organizations of savage tribes, they have followed the development of tribal law and custom, of language and literature, of sciences, religion and art, of altruism and crime from the earliest known beginnings down to the complex structure of western civilization. And always they have arrived at the same conclusion, that the forces of civilization however primitive or advanced owe their original impetus to a primary sense of guilt and the need for its expiation. Stimulated by the discovery that equally primitive layers of organization can be uncovered in every infant, they have postulated a primal origin for this sense of guilt corresponding to the primal origins of infantile guilt. In brief they hold that in course of establishing an

incest barrier, man was compelled to come to terms with his hate as well as with his love. In doing so he found himself forced to acquire the difficult art of loving and hating one person at the same time. As the primitive forms of hate receded into the background without losing their strength thereby, the original episodic system became constant. From that time human development becomes a 'continued story' of the mastery of unconscious guilt. With the birth of every individual the race-history of guilt formation is repeated: for the child too hates the things he loves and must learn to love the thing he hates. The adaptation has been and is still a difficult one to make. One of its by-products is what we call civilization. And civilization is in danger only so long as unmastered quantities of unconscious sadism call into action the dormant forces of masochism.

It is doubtless due to some unconscious appreciation of the strength of these forces that every great war is in turn regarded as a threat to civilization. 'One more war and civilization will perish' is the cry. Man is ready to seize every opportunity of externalizing his unconscious fears and wishes. Any asylum officer can testify that world destruction is the special preoccupation of a certain type of lunatic, though he may not always appreciate that this phantasy is a

projection of the lunatic's conviction that he dare no longer love even himself. And quite recently we have heard no less prominent a figure than the Governor of the Bank of England describe certain economic forces as powers which man may not be able to control. This is, to say the least, a gratuitous act of homage to so-called natural forces. The energies and mental institutions responsible for civilization come from within. And no matter how much we may seek to avoid the fact by attempting to project it, the danger to civilization comes also from within. The dangers of external reality are by comparison with endopsychic dangers easily measurable. And they provoke less fear. War may destroy the products of civilization but unless it is accompanied by a permanent breakdown of internal defences it cannot destroy the tendencies towards civilization. In so far as unconscious masochism is liable to sap internal defences, it may be regarded as the real traitor in the camp, even more dangerous than an excesss of unconscious sadism.

III

THE PROBLEM OF PREVENTION

It is safe to assume that the ultimate reaction of the public to any persistently destructive criticism will be one of rather cold distaste. Only if the disagreeable content has been well sugared, or served with a relish of shrewd wit, may a reasonable degree of assimilation be anticipated. The plain, blunt destructive critic is lucky if he escapes a few hopefully-directed brickbats.

For the student of war and peace there is a moral to be extracted from this seemingly irrational and ungrateful procedure. There is a natural polarity in critical activities, which corresponds to the polarities of love and hate, of creation and destruction. And although consciously we distinguish between thought, utterance and action, such distinctions do not run in the kingdom of the unconscious. For the unconscious, destructive criticism is not simply a purgative process; it is regarded as a calculated assault. So unless the destructive critic is extremely tactful, he is liable to be treated as a malefactor and to have his platform turned into a pillory. Many are intuitively aware of this sensitiveness to any purely aggressive or destructive activity and

take care to introduce a leaven of constructive suggestion in their work. But in any case the expectation that a critic should also be a reformer is as old as civilization. In animistic societies, the demand for 'white' (protective and curative) magic is naturally directed to purveyors of 'black' (destructive) magic. In mediaeval times it was not unknown for the public hangman to turn physician. Even in modern medicine there is a faint suggestion of stigma about the Research Fellow who concentrates on diagnosis, or on the elimination of diagnostic error, to the exclusion of therapeutic concern. As a rule the diagnostician is forced willy-nilly to turn apothecary.

I have emphasized these irrational aspects of human reaction at some length because it seems to me that whoever has the temerity to analyse the motivation of a peace organization has put himself in a peculiarly difficult position. In so far as he seems to criticize the activities of a reformist organization he must appear a doubly destructive critic. He has in a sense put his head in Chancery. On the other hand, the peace organization is bound by its own principles to accord any critic the kindest of hearings and to refrain from any of the more robust forms of reprisal. This is naturally a severe strain on the peace of mind of both parties; and the only way to lessen the tension is to ventilate it at once.

Now the thesis I have put forward with regard to the relations of war and peace is briefly as follows: the psycho-analyst alleges that *concentration of peace propaganda on ethical or economic arguments*, on measures of inhibition, pacts, disarmament treaties or limitations, to the neglect of unconscious motivations, interests and mechanisms, *is in a very real sense a reactionary policy*. He alleges that *peace and war manifestations are both essentially end products, the results obtained by passing the same psychic energies through different mental systems*. Or to put it in another way, that peace and war activities are both solutions of mental tension, the apparent and actual differences being due to the different defensive mechanisms employed. He states that *the driving energy in both cases belongs to the destructive group of instincts*, in particular that variety which when fused with some love components is known as sadism. And in illustration of this he points out that the fanatical pacifist under certain circumstances may be a danger to peace. He points out however that in addition to this active form of destructive impulse, an element of confusion is introduced by a passive form, namely masochism, in which destructive impulses are fused with passive love components. These *passive destructive impulses* are more silent in operation than the active sadistic components: nevertheless they *contribute considerably*

to an unconscious readiness to tolerate or even welcome situations of war. And they do so not merely by paralysing the operation of self-preservative impulse but because the acceptance of suffering in addition to being a primary form of gratification represents a primitive method of overcoming 'unconscious guilt.'

In so far as these conclusions reflect on the existing distribution of pacifist energies they represent a potentially destructive criticism. And the pacifist would be less than human if he did not experience some urge to put a few pointed questions in return. He might be tempted to say, "Well, if you know so much more about our unconscious impulses and motivations than we do ourselves, why not tell us what to do about it all." More downright individuals might even feel affronted and restrain with difficulty the *tu quoque*, "Could you do any better yourself for all your smug armchair psychology?" Anyhow, the inevitable demand, however couched, would be for practical advice: what should we *do*?

If I should appear to evade for a moment this demand for a practical policy, I trust this will not be regarded as a pusillanimous manœuvre designed to conceal the poverty of constructive

thinking. The fact is, however, that my primary concern is not with the hasty formulation of policies. Such a course might indeed prove to be a detrimental one. *To give treatment without adequate diagnosis is the essence of quackery.* Moreover, it is fundamentally unscientific in method. What I do claim is that *we already know sufficient of unconscious motivation in war and peace to make it imperative to know more.* In a negative sense the person who refrains from knowing all that can be known about war and peace is as responsible for the next war as that more positive agent, who first crosses the frontier or fires the first shot. From this point of view the analytical psychologist could scarcely be reproached if he refused to offer any so-called practical suggestions. If he simply said, "The first thing to do is to know," and then pointed out in what directions and by what methods knowledge can be acquired, he would have made an ample and vital contribution to the problem. It would then be the duty of the professional pacifist to set the psychological research institutions of all countries humming with activity; to declare a state of psychological emergency, as one might declare a state of hygienic emergency, were the world threatened with a new plague virus. It is not difficult to imagine the pained indignation of the Daily Press if, in the face of a threatened pandemic, all the available bacteriologists were

found to be busy studying the life-history of harmless fungi.

Yet, so far as 'peace preparedness' is concerned, that is the state of existing psychological investigation. Only a very small band of psycho-analytical investigators in various lands have set themselves the task of tracing human sadism from its earliest sources in the history of the individual; and here and there a few anthropologists endeavour to do the same for the history of the race. These researches have been carried out, in the case of psycho-analysis, to strengthen the therapeutic efficiency of psychological treatment, and in the case of anthropology to make the principles of that science more comprehensible; not, as one might reasonably expect, at the urgent request of peace organizations.

But let us suppose that this extraordinary state of affairs had been rectified: imagine research teams of trained workers subsidized both by governments and by private foundations investigating the whole range of human phenomena, tracing the history of human sadism from the first balling of baby fists in the cradle to the last grimaces of hate petrified in cadaveric rigor on the battlefield: following human ceremonial from cannibalism to Christian communion: amassing and correlating every detail of war reaction, studying every mechanism of peace: sifting the

phenomena of insanity to understand what man is like when the barriers are broken; and examining the buttress systems by means of which an appearance of social normality is maintained. Even so there would still be a demand for 'practical' measures or recommendations, an insistence on *action*. It is one of the specious attractions of economic committees, of equity subcommittees, of meetings and congresses and leagues, that they represent, or seem to represent, action or some immediate approach to action. Without decrying in the least the practical aspect of such activities, *let us consider whether the problem of war is one which can be solved by action*. Assume even that certain defensive actions can definitely prevent war (an assumption which has so far no historical justification), does this constitute a *solution* of the problem? Even so, is it necessary to employ such a cumbrous method? Is there no better solution?

Now in the matter of war policy the position of the average sociologist—and the pacifist whether he knows it or not is a student of applied sociology—resembles that of the Victorian Doctor of Medicine when confronted with a hysterical seizure. Suddenly irritated by such inexplicable behaviour his impulse was either to restrain the

patient forcibly, or to dash a pail of water over her; on the whole rather punitive, though in the symbolic sense not necessarily entirely irrational procedures. If the hysteria took the milder form of indigestion or neuralgia or dropping of the internal organs, he still rushed to *do* something; to give bismuth or aspirin or apply a body belt or open up the abdomen and stitch the kidney. In the first decade of the Twentieth Century, there were literally thousands of sensitive mortals whose bodies showed the actual scars of misguided *rushes to (surgical) action*. The war-time neuroses first helped to popularize views of bodily disturbance which ought to have been domestic knowledge for centuries: first, that quite complicated organic processes can result from disturbance of instinct and adaptation: and second, that the solution of the difficulties in question lies, not in operating or drugging or giving in marriage (i.e. action), but in complete intellectual and emotional *understanding*. The hypnotist and suggestionist had already shown experimentally that it was possible to charm away certain organic conditions (the so-called hysterical conversions) without lifting a finger—but the element of charm prevented full understanding of both symptom and treatment. It was only with the dawn of analytic methods that the radical effect of purely mental exploration was appreciated. Nevertheless,

the bias is still heavily in favour of substituting action for understanding: failing result from action, the tendency is to avert attention from the painful stimulus. In this respect the physician almost automatically adopts neurotic methods of defence. Two neuroses in particular exhibit these defence mechanisms. The obsessional neurotic uses all sorts of ceremonial tricks and gestures and habits to exorcize his painful thought-compulsions; the anxiety hysteric averts interest from all danger zones by the drastic expedient of blotting out huge tracts of mental experience (hysterical amnesia or forgetting). Pacifists with a bias in favour of concrete defensive action follow the obsessional type; the 'man in the street' who tries to put the problem of war on his blind spot and in so doing refuses to think of anything that might remind him of war—including even the possibility of joining the League of Nations Union—is copying the amnesic policies of hysteria.

At this point the discerning critic will be inclined to advance one or two objections. He may say, "Your bias in favour of 'psychic action' as a cure for 'war states' is all very well, but we are informed that even in the case of neurotic individuals the 'complete understanding' you mention involves the use of a highly specialized

technique of mental exploration. Have we any guarantee that psychic action can or will be simply and effectively applied to large groups?" Or he may say, "Your bias in favour of 'psychic action' involves putting all your eggs in one basket. You are preoccupied with internal psychic factors and therefore ignore external, environmental conditions. Even if we agree that economic factors are not primary, you must agree that they are nevertheless extremely important and require concrete handling. Moreover, you appear to neglect altogether external psychological influences: surely something can be done to modify warlike tendencies. Besides, we can't wait. Something must be *done* here and now."

To these cogent questions my preliminary response must again appear unduly chicken-hearted. I am prepared for the moment to evade reply to the first question, merely repeating that *bias* in favour of concrete action must be overcome if we are going to estimate at all accurately the value of peace propaganda. On the other hand, the relation of internal factors (i.e. the nature of primitive instincts and defence mechanisms) to (a) external psychological factors such as the influence of family upbringing, social standards, etc., and (b) external economic factors, strikes to the root of all sociological effort. So I propose to spend the most of my available space in its

consideration. How far should one *direct attention* to the *psychic state of the individual* or *attempt to deal concretely with end products* through *environment*?

On this issue scientists of varying breed have from time to time expressed strong opinions. I hasten, therefore, to reassure the reader. So far from having any desire to wax pontifical on the subject, I am acutely aware of the very shaky title psychology has to pontificate about anything. In recent times the market has been flooded with psychological textbooks designed to regulate the conduct of life; and it says a good deal for human common sense that these have latterly been met with an increasing amount of ribald comment. The turn of events is justified. A long-suffering and suggestible public has at last come to realize that a spate of publications on the behaviouristic aspects of new psychologies is to some extent a fresh monument to human fatuity. But of course there is a shade of uneasiness behind this newly acquired freedom to criticize and a certain amount of relief behind the malicious glee and contempt with which the more fatuous productions are greeted. The lay public, from the 'plain man in the street' to the most accomplished metaphysician, has always maintained that every man can and must be his own psychologist. It has resented any attempt to claim for psychology the immunity from uninstructed interference accorded

any other exact science. It has made scornful comparisons between the inept fumbblings of applied psychology and the spontaneous wisdom of the sages. But in spite of this cogent comparison the resentment is, like most resentments, to a large extent dictated by anxiety. There is always the disturbing possibility that psychology might be able to penetrate the deepest layers of human motivation and shake the compact system of rationalizations interposed between these layers and consciousness!

Now let us suppose for the sake of argument not only that the Great Powers applied themselves seriously to problems of war and peace, but that they were temporarily converted to a psychological viewpoint. They would then instruct their central organization—the League of Nations or whatever—to set about establishing Research Institutes in all countries. The League of Nations would doubtless appoint Psychological Advisory Committees to assist in organization, and would feel justified in referring to a Central Advisory Body any problems that appeared to be capable of immediate solution. It is interesting to speculate on the constitution of this Central Board. To begin with we are safe in assuming that the new enthusiasm would be combined with a careful

regard for tradition. Apart from its more realistic preoccupations the League has functioned, up to the present, not merely as a nursery for new idealizations, but as a forcing ground for traditional diplomacy. It would therefore decide on a 'thoroughly representative' Board. Having surmounted the difficulty of international representation it would next tackle the problem of representing different schools or branches of psychology. In so doing it would gain the approbation of all scientifically minded people and at the same time prepare the way for ultimate stultification.

First of all the ancient seats of learning would be called upon to send delegates. And they would respond enthusiastically. A flock of Academic Psychologists would gather from Upsala, Oxford, Greifswald, St. Andrews, Yale, Warsaw, Paris, Padua and Salamanca. Now whatever may be said about 'new' (that is to say, modern) psychologies, it is certain they were never spawned in academic waters. So the League would feel bound to invite representatives from various 'clinical schools.' It is possible but by no means certain that these would include a psychoanalytical delegate. Anyhow the list would be rounded off with a few distinguished freelance psychologists, i.e. individuals who on the strength of earlier interests in metaphysics or humanism

have developed psychological systems of their own. The whole Body would of course be leavened by the inclusion of a few biologists, invited under the misapprehension that biologists have 'something to do' with psychology.

Doubtless the first point to be decided by this Board would be the efficacy of preventive measures. At any rate we will assume that some member of the League Secretariat, having listened to an unusually acrimonious debate on disarmament decided to relieve his feelings by 'guying' the Psychological Board and submitted the following test question, viz.: *should children be allowed pop-guns?* Incidentally this is by no means a frivolous problem; it is one that has been totally and shamefully neglected by disarmament committees. For *if disarmament is a cure for war, it is only logical to inquire whether it should not be enforced in the nursery.*

It may be said at once that this issue would raise the most acute dissension. Even those representatives who appeared to agree would do so for different reasons. Thus it would be maintained by the 'humanists' and the 'environmental stimuli' school that to avoid inculcating or educating warlike tendencies, children should *not* be allowed pop-guns. The 'behaviourists' would join with the 'play psychologists' in protesting that a child who has never seen a pop-gun will point his

finger at his nurse and utter the magic monosyllable 'pop.' In so saying they merely emphasize the fact that the inventors of the pop-gun, to say nothing of the water pistol, the howitzer and the gas-shell, must have been themselves children.¹ Or more technically, that the child in his manipulation of external objects, both animate and inanimate, projects on to them his bodily functions and endows them with his own instinctual strivings. The 'active cathartic' school would then chime in to say that such being the case, it is clearly advantageous for children to be given 'firearms' to play with. But some 'suggestionists' would at once disagree. Favouring a system of defence by the 'reinforcement of antithetical ideas' they would insist on the contrary that all children should be given corked bottles and corkscrews. Their colleagues, the 'suggestionists by direct displacement,' would enter a protest here. They would say: there is no need to invert the situation: by all means let the child have his pop-gun, but substitute as soon as possible the game of tiddleywinks, and then divert his attention as soon as possible from tiddleywinks to crossword puzzles or to practical chemistry.

¹ It is a sobering reflection that one of the most distinguished English pacifists of this century should be at the same time the author of a remarkable playbook for children called *Little Wars*.

This recommendation would immediately cause a small war between various 'fixation' schools. Seizing on the phrase 'as soon as possible,' the 'constitutional factor' group would say that a short period of gratification would be liable to induce traumatic 'fixation,' to make the child a secret and permanent addict to pop-gunnery. On the other hand, those interested in 'individual factors in fixation' would argue that it was risky to allow too long a period of gratification lest it should induce fixation to the gangster phase.

It is unnecessary to labour the point farther. The Central Board would be unable to reach agreement. And if their Final Report took the form of this confession, all would be well. An honest disagreement honestly arrived at is an invaluable preliminary to more positive research. But it is too much to expect an International Advisory Board to admit advisory incapacity however temporary, more especially if the incapacity can be concealed behind Blue Books of majority and minority reports.

Had this problem of the pop-gun been put to a psycho-analyst, say about 25 years ago, his answer might have been much more emphatic than it would be now. In those days conceptions of mental conflict were greatly influenced by the

discovery of actual *traumatic experiences*, i.e. environmental stimuli, which had occurred at critical phases in the childhood of the individual and round which it was felt most neurotic constructions were arranged. This view was an enormous advance on then existing theories of neurotic disorder by which the latter was attributed to some *immediate* adult factor, e.g. spinsterhood, childlessness, or shock from railway accidents. Then came the equally revolutionary discovery that the traumatic elements responsible for precipitating a neurosis *need not be real* (*environmental*) *experiences*, that an entirely phantastic system of unconscious ideas, if charged with sufficient energy, can give rise to neurotic disorder. Not only can phantastic (internal) systems induce neurotic reaction, but for the first few years of life, the child constructs for itself *a phantastic external world* to which it reacts with apprehensiveness, fear, anger and hate. The real world, such as the adult recognizes, is real to the child only in so far as certain objects in the environment cater for the child's self-preservative and love needs. For the rest it is simply an anchorage for the projections of frustrated instinct, in particular, aggressive instinct. The development of this primitive animistic system has been sketched in the previous chapters. It only remains to add that the infant will see not only pop-guns

but death-dealing instruments of war in paper-bags, in balloons, in Jacks-in-the-Box, in puffs of smoke from the fire, in noisy bathroom pipes or in flapping curtains. It will misinterpret the masticatory noises of its nurse at tea-table, the crackling of dry toast, the squeak of shoes, the spluttering of kettles or the rattling of window casements, regarding these quite impartially as so many declarations of war on itself. The precautions and anxieties exhibited at this stage constitute what is naïvely called the 'nervousness' of the child although it is more obviously akin to madness. *In short we now know that in the absence of real external traumata stimuli the child will manufacture external stimuli of its own.*

Anyhow, it is apparent that the psychoanalysts' views on the significance of environmental factors must have passed through all the stages represented by the Majority and Minority Reports of the Central Board. And in terms of the pop-gun controversy these would, if assembled and all given equal value, end in contradiction. As a matter of fact it was due to a recognition of this difficulty that psychoanalysts have been in the past so chary (timid or conservative) in formulating behaviouristic codes. And so far they have reason to congratulate themselves. They have before them the awful example of enthusiastic parents who, more Royalist than the King, have

swallowed hasty doses of badly compounded information and inflicted the result on their own children.

The psycho-analyst's delay has stood him in good stead. Extending the Horatian probationary period from seven to about thirty-five years, he has given himself time to discover a fundamental psychic situation common to all children up to the age of five. He is now able to show that these early mad and neurotic phases of development must be passed through by every child. And turning this discovery to advantage in the diagnosis of war situations, he adds that the *instincts giving rise to war phenomena belong to that period and to no other*. He also states that *the foundations of peace reactions are laid in the same period*, but is ready to agree that they are strengthened to some extent during the phases of childhood and early puberty.

It is evident that if a psycho-analyst were represented on the Advisory Board, his report on the pop-gun problem would be limited in the first instance to the statement that it was not in itself a problem but a red-herring. Anything that distracts attention from primary factors to one of a great number of secondary factors is ultimately an obstacle to research. Put this now in terms of adult or international disarmament and it runs: *disarmament is a secondary or auxiliary*

manœuvre fostering an artificial state of peace; hence exaggeration of the importance of this factor is an obstacle to understanding and ultimately to attaining a stable peace organization.

The reader will doubtless have arrived at the conclusion that if the foregoing is a sample of psycho-analytic thinking, the analyst must be not only a pessimist by profession but a confirmed sceptic as to the value of peace propaganda. To this the analyst would reply that there is no *a priori* justification for either optimism or pessimism in dealing with an instinctual problem; secondly, that it is not pessimistic to take an exact measure of a problem, and finally that it is false optimism to be content with auxiliary devices, neglecting the prime factor. *If world disarmament (taking this in the sense of scrapping existing or modern weapons of aggression) were achieved tomorrow, the problem of war and peace would remain unsolved.*

‘But,’ the critic will say, ‘you must admit that if war and peace depend on the child’s reaction to a mad battle with primitive instinct, or relate to a wildly phantastic phase of development of reality sense, then we can only be secure provided the effects of this phase can be dealt with in a sufficient number of instances. At the very least

all governing classes and officials of all countries in the world will have to be cured of any lasting effects of this phase. Don't you think then the outlook is particularly black?' This is an argument which might well have been advanced in the early days of diphtheria anti-toxin; because you have discovered the *Bacillus diphtheria* and manufactured an anti-body, and because at the moment there isn't enough anti-body to 'go round,' don't you think the Public Health outlook is particularly blue? The fact is that the psycho-analyst is slowly grappling with this problem of the primitive phase of infancy and despite a chorus of cries of 'wolf' from professional colleagues has proceeded to evolve a form of treatment for adult insanity. And he is almost prepared to say that these mad states taken at a favourable opportunity, best of all during childhood, can be *radically* altered.

Once again I shall shelve the question whether the population as a whole can be psycho-analysed. Let us in the meantime consider possible alternatives. However he may estimate their depth of effect, the psycho-analyst is the last to deny that alternatives of some sort exist. Of the many reasons for forming this conclusion, the following may be cited: that most children and a few lunatics show a capacity to develop spontaneously out of such phases: that environmental factors, in particular the distribution of love and hate interest, play

some part in this apparently spontaneous process: that non-analytical forms of treatment exist (suggestion, hypnosis), which bring about a readjustment of internal disturbances provided a definite environmental emotional situation (rapport) is established and maintained. Finally, although the analyst no longer regards early traumatic environmental factors as the main excitor of neurotic conflict, he does not deny that they have some significance. All he says is that they are secondary factors.

Nevertheless in so saying he has put himself under obligation to express some sort of opinion on the pop-gun issue. And provided his main point is conceded, he has no objection to any general formulation which does not exclude the possibility of elastic handling in individual cases. Agreeing that play has important ventilating, stabilizing, reassurance and research functions to perform, he will be in favour of giving even greater scope to play. He is aware that extra-familial necessity will impose limits to this activity, but will agree that infra-familial boundaries might well be extended. He will, however, stipulate that the child's play system should not be exploited by an adult for his or her own purposes, that the adult should not introduce either stimulating or inhibiting elements which have nothing to do with the child's immediate circle

of interest or are beyond its scope. This naturally necessitates knowledge of the actual order of development of infantile interest. Put more generally: the spontaneous play manipulation of objects (including pop-gunlike objects) need not cause any perturbation in the parent's mind, *provided it does not take a form that is symptomatic and provided during this phase the parents are performing their parental functions adequately*. The function of the parents (preservative duties apart) is to provide and maintain a reassuring human environment (essentially loving the child without fear, jealousy or hate), during the animistic phase when the child is struggling with a phantastic and terrifying 'reality' mostly of its own construction.

Having rather laboriously arrived at this tentative and elastic formulation, let us use it as a measure of the environmental influences actually brought to bear on the child. Keeping in mind our main problem, how to influence the warlike or pacific tendencies of the child, let us put the following question: pop-guns apart, how do parents actually behave towards their children and what effect is that likely to have on the child's future behaviour? Expressed in a form that will appeal to psychologists with a bias in favour of the importance of environmental

factors, the question is as follows: Even assuming that psychological environment has an important influence on future reactions to war and peace, what is that environment; and secondly, if it is hoped to alter that environment, just how radical and comprehensive is the alteration going to be?

It may be said at once that the only person in a position to answer the first part of the question satisfactorily is the psycho-analyst. The behaviourist it is true can give us sample observations. And these are startling enough. Only to the analyst, however, is the stark truth painfully unfolded by both adult and child. *And the truth is that the human environment of the child is charged with feelings of anxiety and hate, with envy and jealousy, with tyrannical impatience and with aggressive and sadistic impulses which seldom stop short of psychic cruelty and sometimes proceed to positive physical cruelty.* In some instances these attitudes and impulses are not concealed (*vide* the records of the Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Children): in many others they are mixed with or partly disguised by attitudes of parental love, care and patience. But these more or less obvious manifestations are less dangerous than the hidden tendencies. The fact has to be faced that behind a seemingly stable and dependable organization of parental, familial or social loving-kindness there

are concealed attitudes of hate, anxiety and guilt towards children. Disguised frequently by a degree of genuine parental solicitude these tendencies are given indirect expression and provoke in the child in some instances even stronger counter-reactions of hate and fear than do the unvarnished cruelties recognized by the criminal code.

It is no mere matter of pop-guns. Within the first few weeks or days of life, the parents, having experienced some amount of preliminary ecstasy, begin to lay down policies which do not stop short of psychic and physical cruelty to their own babies. By the time the child has got the length of its first rag picture book, these tendencies have become consolidated into a silent conspiracy. There is hardly a picture or nursery rhyme book in existence which does not broadcast tales of cruelty, punishment and mutilation. There is certainly not one public park in Europe which cannot be justifiably described as a nursling's Star Chamber. True the children are not openly flogged, at any rate not so much as in earlier decades, but they are persistently subjected to psychic tyranny, torture and blackmail even by consciously well-meaning and solicitous 'child-minders.' And even if each individual case were traced to its home, there is no guarantee that the actual mother will behave more reasonably. The hysterical loving mother is, after the baby, the

world's first blackmailer. I say 'after the baby' advisedly. There is no need to gloss over the fact that the baby is a primitive organism, an exacting tyrant and parasite whose first maladroit performance is an unwitting attempt to rend its mother's body in labour, and who proceeds in its own interest and anxiety to blackmail its parents into accepting a situation that is frequently intolerable to the adult. *There is no need to moralize over the primitive attitudes of either parent or child. But if there is to be any attempt to control these primitive attitudes effectively, there is urgent need to pull aside the curtains of real and false sentiment that prevent recognition of the most dangerous forces in life.*

Here at any rate is a research on which psychologists of all schools can concentrate from different angles. When their results have been pooled and when the whole truth concerning familial relations is known, the ground will be to some extent prepared for a gigantic *experiment* in modification of psychological environment. Anything short of a large scale experiment will be useless. Only when a slightly disillusioned adult generation is prepared to abandon its technique of covering hate by love¹ and to cease exploiting or making

¹ A well-known pacifist, whose approach to the problem is mainly ethical, criticizes the importance attached to sadism in these essays. He expresses surprise that little or no mention is made of the positive love factors contributing to pacifist energies, and therefore takes exception to the

vicarious sacrifices of children, is there any real chance of arriving at a definite conclusion as to the importance of environmental factors in stimulating or inhibiting war-mindedness.

And it is not only a question of familial environment. As the infant grows into childhood, it is passed from hand to hand and there is no guarantee that any of these hands will refrain from striking it as it passes. It is indeed the proud boast of many English fathers that their children can still be flogged on the same public school whipping blocks on which they were themselves educated. There is still less guarantee that psychic blackmail view that the energies of war and pacifism have much in common. If people could only be persuaded to love one another more, the problem would, he thinks, be solved. I have never suggested that infantile and adult love energies however rarified do not promote peace. On the contrary the problem has been to explain why, despite all the natural tendencies in favour of peace, there is no certainty of peace. And the facts remain that *infantile* love tendencies *are* closely related to hate reactions, that conscious love is an excellent '*cover*' for unconscious hate and that the energies driving the most active part of unconscious conscience are certainly sadistic in origin. Perhaps the best way of expressing the relation is to say that whereas a sufficient excess of love will certainly help to promote peace and a sufficient excess of hate will certainly promote war, the *uncertainties* of war and peace are due to various mixtures of unconscious *love and hate* which are well described as unconscious "ambivalence."

will not be levied on the same journey, that the child will not be exposed to artifices of love and hate, praise and blame, petting or neglect, having as their unconscious object the appeasement of the adult's own sense of guilt. Once again there is here no question of moralizing over or taking sides in the eternal war between parents (or their substitutes) and the child (or its substitutes). Let us admit freely that many of these manoeuvres are intended to curb or divert the frankly primitive impulses of the child: and further, that to do him justice the adult is prepared to behave in the same way towards adults. He will fulminate from pulpits at the sins of society, from sociological platforms at signs of 'degeneracy' in the race; from the Opposition Bench at the acephalic stupidities of the Treasury. In fact cloaking his responsibilities behind the Majesty of the Law he will imprison, flog or decapitate his 'erring' contemporaries. But there is no special virtue in being indignant about this state of affairs. Indignation over misfortune (i.e. painful function) is the privilege of the infant and the peculiarity of the savage. When an infant has a sudden colic, even those onlookers who cannot understand why it proceeds to kick the nurse in the stomach are ready to forgive it on the nurse's behalf, i.e. to accord it a temporary privilege. When the savage has an abdominal pain he is prepared to pay a

medicine-man to deal with this magical attack by some counter-magic directed against a real or imagined enemy. This is a system which we Westerns are able to regard as 'peculiar' because we have hidden our own magical reactions under the guise of medical treatment. We pay a physician (scientist) to drive out inner enemies with purgatives, and we scare off our outer enemies with antiseptic sprays. The civilized adult who experiences a fine indignation over human frailties is behaving as one who would fly into a rage because there is such a thing as acute biliary colic. This blinding pain is essentially a problem of metabolic function. And the humane onlooker will be in a better position to correct or alleviate painful functioning if he keeps calm. He will certainly be ineffective if, on the plea that he has never experienced acute pain in his epigastric regions, he denies that there is any such organ as the liver. He will be equally ineffective if he turns his back on the sufferer because abdominal organs are 'not nice to think about.' *Any experiments in environmental influence, conducted with a view to immobilizing tendencies to war-like behaviour, can scarcely be called experiments until the actual facts have been ascertained without either indignation or aversion.*

If we express all this more technically it will be

apparent that we have dealt with one aspect only of the environmental problem, viz.: how far modification of the sadistic influences brought to bear on children would ease the child's difficulties in dealing with its own destructive impulses. We know however that aggression and hate are the natural reaction, not only to attack from without but to the thwarting of *any* set of primitive impulses. Clearly then *the effect of frustration in general must be investigated*: are there any groups of primitive impulse subject to special frustration and inhibition?

It will scarcely be denied by any reflective person that the whole group of sexual impulses (taking these in the broadest sense, from the primitive libidinal strivings of the newly born infant to the organized and easily recognized impulses of the adult) are subject to a number of limitations imposed from without. These limitations are either arbitrary and irrational or rationalized on the strength of religious, moral, ethical or social sanctions. They are imposed with a degree of stringency, varying from the pressure of 'good form' to, in some countries, the pain of the lash or the ostracism of penal servitude. Knowing that there is a close connection between frustrated sexual impulses and hate reactions, it has sometimes occurred to psycho-analysts to consider whether in the case of infants and small

children some more sane system of environmental response would reduce the child's struggle with sadistic hate. Being naturally cautious he has not gone beyond considering possibilities. Many self-appointed amateurs, however, have rushed in to conduct what they regard as 'experiments.' We are now familiar with 'enlightened' parents who will insist on ceremonial undressing before their children, or with even more enthusiastic reformers who believe that by altering this or that adult convention the millennium will come about.

The only conclusion that can be drawn from such 'experiments' is that the enthusiasm of the experimenter has paralysed his capacity for clear thinking. Granted that there is a dangerous component of sado-masochism in the parents' relation to the child, that the parental attitude to infantile sexual manifestations is absurdly alarmist, *all we are entitled to conclude is that alteration of these attitudes would give the child a better chance of adapting to reality.* It does not even follow that most children could or would take that chance. For the moment that is a matter of personal opinion. The optimistic experimentalist tends to neglect three important considerations. In the first place, the frustrated impulses giving rise to maximal hate-reactions never could be gratified in reality: they are too primitive, i.e. impossible: secondly, the alterations in environment required

by the child are equally impossible: thirdly, the attempted reassurances may actually frighten the child. As I once expressed it, the gesture of ceremonial undressing before a child is, from the point of view of primitive impulse, like offering an alligator a bun: from the point of view of reassurance it may be as frightening as the appearance of a boa constrictor at the nursery tea table. And all the time the child may be more concerned with the shadow thrown by a curtain. In any case the child itself shows that really drastic measures are necessary to deal with its anxieties because it spontaneously employs the most primitive and powerful mental mechanisms to curb them. Hence *environmental alterations to be effective would have to be radical enough to obviate the necessity for projection or repression*. Now on this point the analyst can bring forward certain interesting if tentative conclusions. So far as his experience goes he has no reason to suppose that he can 'do away with' these developmental phases, but he does believe that given a suitable opportunity and sufficient time he can alter radically the effects of faulty function of these mechanisms.

We are now in a position to give a straightforward reply to the questions left unanswered in the earlier parts of this chapter. The analyst

believes that the environmental influences brought to bear on the child could be fundamentally altered to the great advantage of infantile adaptation. He is in favour of measures directed towards the elimination of sadism and sadistic inhibition from parental policies. He is even prepared to give his blessing to experimental research in these directions, provided the researches are not carried out by enthusiastic (biased) amateurs. On the other hand, although he believes that the phases of development responsible for war or peace reactions can be *favourably influenced* by environmental measures of a thorough and comprehensive kind, he cannot believe that such phases can be *radically altered* in this way. *He cannot say definitely that comprehensive changes in environmental policies will prove an effective safeguard against war.* Finally he says that the only radical approach to the most primitive phases is a prolonged individual analytical approach, adding the rider that it may be impossible to bring about a deep change in the attitude of parents to their children until they too have been treated by the same process.

One can readily imagine the critic's reaction to all this. "At last," he will say, "the cat is out of the bag. You set out to make our flesh creep by a description of a Primitive Infantile Unconscious responsible for war and peace and end by ad-

mitting that this system is accessible only to a highly specialized approach. Unless you can now show that this method can be applied to large numbers, you have wasted our time."

A more cynical observer might have difficulty in restraining the comment that there is evidently nothing like leather. This gibe would of course be unanswerable, and indeed I have never pretended that the views put forward are not psycho-analytical. Nor have I attempted to establish the validity of psycho-analytical principles, merely to apply these principles to the problems of war and pacifism. Even if we take for granted that nothing short of psycho-analysis of the race will safeguard against war—an extreme position which I have not so far maintained—the fact that psycho-analysis is a new and, numerically speaking, feeble instrument is no justification for either despair or contempt. It is true that owing to the peculiar psychological difficulties inherent in the work, psycho-analysis has not expanded so rapidly as other young sciences. By comparison bacteriology and immunology made more rapid strides in the first forty years. But then bacteriology never roused the same deep antagonisms: apart from an early phase of vilification by medical colleagues and a later passionate aversion to vaccine treatment on the part of a group of lay people, bacteriology soon wrested for itself both

popular and academic recognition. And at the present time it gathers moral, financial and scientific support not only in every civilized country, but in every county-town, almost in every village. Psycho-analysis has not expanded and may never expand at the same rate, although already organized Institutes are to be found in most civilized countries. But there is no reason to assume that given time and the overcoming of psychological inhibitions, antagonism and inertia, it will not advance to the stage of performing an important ventilating function.

The details of this expansion may for the moment be left to the Utopist. The latter will doubtless visualize an age when the number of available analysts will equal the existing number of nurses, teachers, scout-masters, psycho-therapists, faith healers, quack doctors, prison warders, commissioned officers, monarchs and hangmen. This could in fact be achieved at a cost much less than 0·1 per cent. of the total sum spent on armament, and without the loss of one life.

In the meantime these Utopian considerations can be more objectively expressed in the form of a time factor. Those who believe that war will never die out are bound to concede that there is ample time in which to organize psychological preventive measures. But even if it is held that another large-scale war will break out fifty years

hence, there is yet time to take some elementary precautions. For example, given co-operation from the parties concerned, there is time to find out how many dictators, Foreign Secretaries, diplomats and peace delegates suffer from psycho-sexual impotence or have a secret fear of impotence. A prerequisite of this co-operation is however common recognition of two important facts, viz.: that impotence in some cases contributes to pacific tendencies, whilst unconscious fear of impotence is a common cause of war-mindedness and grandiosity. Space forbids any elaboration of those psycho-pathological factors. But it is just possible that fifty years might suffice to establish in the governing classes the beginnings of a system of psychological 'good form.' In this hygienic country, we have seen the beginnings of sanitary good form. We have, it is true, seen that sanitary scrupulosity can run mad. But at least some positive benefits have accrued. It is no longer good form for a man with a streaming cold to sneeze unguarded over the bridge table, or to wave a wet bandana in the faces of his friends. Some day it may be bad form for an anxiety hysteric to assume Cabinet rank¹ during

¹ Since writing this I have made a few discreet inquiries both directly and through reliable indirect sources as to the incidence of neurotic or characterological idiosyncracies amongst Cabinet Ministers past and present in two countries. The results are, of course, statistically worthless,

an attack of anxiety, or for a 'persecutory type' to act as an Ambassador during an international crisis, or for an obsessional neurotic suffering from indecision and compulsive doubt to preside at a Disarmament Conference. This again may be a Utopian view. In any case, there is no advantage to be gained by starting work in a state of impatience, optimism or discouragement. Doubtless the most realistic course would be to sit down soberly and draw up a Thousand Years' Plan aimed at the resolution of unconscious conflict without recourse to war.

but it is clear that neurotic foibles and inhibitions are at any rate not less common in this than in other groups. In course of this tentative investigation, I have encountered the apologetic argument that the neuroses of Ministers of the Crown are irrelevant since the individuals in question are busy living up to an official façade or administrative ideal. I am prepared to admit that the existence of such façades is to a certain extent a safeguard: but I have never found that they operated effectively in the case of less exalted neurotics. In the long run neurosis, like murder, will out: and, to qualify the aphorism of a celebrated military dictator who was also an intuitive psychologist, "Neurotic Character is Destiny in Burlesque."

IV

AN OUTLINE OF RESEARCH

"I am sorry to say that it is a common practice with romancers to announce their hero as a man of extraordinary genius and then leave his works entirely to the reader's imagination; so that at the end of the book you whisper to yourself ruefully that but for the author's solemn preliminary assurance you should hardly have given the gentleman credit for ordinary good sense."—SHAW: *Man and Superman*, 1903, Dedicatory Epistle, pp. xxv-vi

SHAW's criticism of the romancer on the score of slipshodness of method can, with a few verbal alterations, be applied with equal cogency to the publications of some reformers. In not a few instances the practical proposals of the humanitarian are in inverse ratio to his zeal. Not that this is any aspersion on the zealot. Even if it were universally true—which is far from the case—propagandist enthusiasm can function usefully as a thorn in the well-protected flesh of the unimaginative. Nor is the plain blunt man altogether in the right, when, stung to reprisal, he roundly accuses the reformer of substituting the products of a heated imagination for sound common sense. In this respect the plain man

shares with the nineteenth-century scientist the fallacious view that imagination has no place in scientific method. Imagination—by which is implied the application of unconscious modes of thought to mundane affairs—is the most economical of all instruments of research. Discovery is simply a process of short-circuiting modes of thought, observation and adaptation, which being generally accepted are regarded as rational rather than rigid: discoveries come about mostly through an elaboration of conscious content by the unconscious processes of symbolism, identification and condensation. Nevertheless, both layman and scientist are in the right when they take exception to the ‘heat’ of the reformer’s imagination. In other words, unconscious modes of thinking are invaluable, provided of course they do not stray from the subject, whereas both unconscious and conscious affects (potential and actual emotions) are more often than not obstacles to research and end as a rule in false conclusions.

What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. It has to be admitted that many psychologists fall between two stools. On the one hand they are inclined to treat psychology as the romancer would a combined hero, oracle and genius: on the other they are proud to ape the manners of the positive scientist, to accept his fallacies and by excluding imagination to commit

scientific *hari-kiri*. This latter tendency accounts to some extent for the arid nature of old academic psychologies and for the laboratory frills and overalls of much experimental psychology. That clinical schools of psychology are credited with some vital quality is due not so much to their concern with 'human documents' as to the fact that in a great deal of this work, unconscious processes are not only uncovered in the object of investigation, but used as part of a research technique. Open recognition of these facts, together with a frank admission of the confusion due to unconscious emotion, permits an adequate approach to any problem without assuming either omnipotence or esoteric privilege. Once this method of approach through unconscious processes is more widely recognized, a good deal of the prestige-anxiety or heartburning which attaches to research work (e.g. whether it is good or bad, brilliant or dull, useful or useless) will disappear. The value of any one piece of research will depend on the distribution of interest as between conscious and unconscious aspects of the problem, and as between conscious and 'unconscious' methods of approaching it. Following these general principles I have drawn up a very rough sketch of a possible organized research on war. Although it does not pretend to be comprehensive this outline may conceivably serve to

suggest that a psychological approach to war problems is something more than an academic day-dream.

OUTLINE OF RESEARCH ON THE PROBLEM OF WAR

*(For the consideration of some future International
War Research Board)*

PREMISSES

- (I) That there are individual and social advantages to be gained by the Abolition of War : nevertheless,
- (II) that these are periodically offset by individual or social advantages to be obtained in or through a war situation ;
- (III) that in the estimation of advantages conscious judgment is not necessarily a decisive factor.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

To investigate the relations of War to Peace and Pacifism, and to report from time to time on :

- (1) the practicability of large-scale preventive experiments,
- (2) the practicability of finding substitutes for the advantages of war,

- (3) the practicability of eliminating war advantages.

DURATION

Researches to be organized using time-units of from 5 to 50 years. A formal Interim Report to be presented to existing National Governments, and/or a central organization at the end of 50 years. Tentative conclusions arrived at by short-period researches to be available on application. Small-scale experiments to be conducted over a minimum period of 15 years. Large-scale experiments to be planned on 100 to 1,000 years' basis. Except in case of urgency no large-scale experiment to be initiated before the lapse of 50 years, i.e., before some degree of objective estimation of data has been achieved.

WORKING HYPOTHESES FOR THE GUIDANCE OF INVESTIGATORS

- (1) That, superficial descriptive criteria apart, War and Peace do not stand in an antithetical relationship. War is not simply the opposite of Peace or Peace the counterpart of War. They have common origins but are forced into an arbitrary relation owing to some outstanding differences in end-results. Nevertheless,

- (2) that on the whole there is a general tendency to cathartic abreaction in War and a general tendency to defence by reaction-formation in peace :
- (3) that these general tendencies are combined in the case of both War and Peace with a number of other primary and secondary (auxiliary) tendencies, the operation of which requires individual investigation. Many, probably the great majority, of these tendencies are to be found operative under both war and peace conditions (e.g. masochistic factors) :
- (4) that investigation of war and peace tendencies cannot be limited merely to investigation of mechanisms bringing about pro- or anti-war (pacifist) attitudes respectively :
- (5) that War and Peace are functional phenomena. Their functions cannot be accurately estimated without some understanding of mental function in general, in both its individual and social aspects :
- (6) that in regard to individual aspects, consciousness under ordinary conditions gives access to superficial phenomena only :
- (7) that unconscious mental systems exist in a dynamic as distinct from a descriptive sense.

METHODS OF INVESTIGATION

I. DIRECT

- A. *At conscious levels.*—Behaviouristic data in general. Ordinary data of introspection. Selected (Method "A.")
- B. *At preconscious levels.*—Available on closer unselected introspection with or without the assistance of suggestion or hypnosis. (Method "B.")
- C. *At unconscious levels.*—Available to some extent with the assistance of deep hypnosis otherwise accessible only to psycho-analytic methods. (Method "C.")

II. INDIRECT

Inferences drawn from the study of historical records or products of human activity

- (a) following rational systems of thought,
- (b) following irrational (unconscious) systems of thought. (Method "D.")

PRELIMINARY COLLECTION OF DATA

I. ON WAR

A. *Adult War*

- (1) Indirect: History of adult war in primitive, barbaric and civilized races: individual and group aspects. (Approach by Method "D": conducted by research

teams selected for immediate convenience from different civilized countries. When this survey relates to the recent history of any one civilized country, the research should, as far as conscious and preconscious aspects are concerned, be conducted or controlled by an international team.) Special research on the psychological sequence of group events leading to any one outbreak.

- (2) Direct: Investigation (Methods "A," "B," "C") of combatants or ex-combatants with a view to ascertaining (a) the psychological sequence of individual events through the pre-war phase up to and including the outbreak of war, (b) conscious and unconscious impulses and reactions under war conditions, (c) the psychological sequelae of war experience in apparently stable as well as obviously unstable (symptom-forming) individuals. Examples: character changes in stable individuals: war neuroses, psychoses, etc., in unstable individuals.

B. *Adolescent War*. (Methods "A," "B," "C" and "D.")

- (1) The constitution of adolescent groups.

- (2) The hostile aspects of inter-group relations.
- (3) The hostile relations of adult to adolescent groups: (a) physical, examples: initiation ceremonies in primitive tribes, flogging of adolescents; (b) mental: psychic aggrandizement, moral discipline or strictures, reproach, exhortation, etc.
- (4) The hostile relations of adolescent to adult groups: (a) physical: occasionally attacks of violence; (b) mental: hostility, contempt, scorn, caricature, negativism, rebellion.

C. *Child War*. (Methods "A," "B," "C," "D.") Subjects as in Section B (1), (2), (3) and (4), substituting 'child' for 'adolescent' and 'familial group' for 'adult group.'

D. *Infantile War*. (Methods "A," "B," "C" and "D.") (Method "C," i.e. direct analytical exploration, is usually inapplicable before the age of eighteen months, i.e. before the child can use some verbal expression or at any rate apprehend verbal communication. Analytical inferences can however be drawn from properly oriented observation of infants up to that age.) Problems: (1) the psychological constitution of the infant; (2) the

hostile aspects of individual infantile relations (a) to other individual infants, (b) to nursery groups with and without nursery adults—nurses, parents, etc.; (3) as in Section B substituting ‘infantile’ for ‘adolescent’ and ‘nursery adults’ for ‘adult groups.’

II. ON PACIFISM

A. *Adult Pacifism*

- (1) Indirect (Method “D”): The history of adult pacifism in primitive, barbaric and civilized races. (In the case of primitive and barbaric races it is difficult to disentangle this issue from the issues of animism and religion respectively. In the case of civilized races the relation of pacifism to religious systems is obscured by more abstract moral considerations and by more concrete economic preoccupations.) Examples: How various tribes or races come to terms with enemies: the preponderance of mechanisms of introjection and projection in pacifist technique; e.g. how far certain groups deal with hate by establishing a system of *inner* enemies, how far others prefer *external* enemies: a comparison

of systems: animism-magic: religion-forgiveness: sociology-peace conferences.

- (2) Direct (Methods "A," "B" and "C") :
 - (a) the technique of pacifist groups before, during or after war: (b) the psychological sequence of events in individual pacifists before, during and after war.

B. Adolescent Pacifism.

- (1) Indirect (Method "D").
- (2) Direct (Methods "A," "B" and "C").

C. Child Pacifism.

- (1) Indirect (Method "D").
- (2) Direct (Methods "A," "B" and "C").

D. Infantile Pacifism.

- (1) Indirect (Method "D").
- (2) Direct (Methods "A," "B" and "C").

(To avoid tedious repetition it may be said that, substituting the terms 'pacifist' and 'peace' for 'hostile' and 'war,' the problems arising in these various sub-sections are identical with the problems described in Section I on War. In this respect sub-section D on Infantile Pacifism is by far the most important: e.g. how the infant comes to terms with its enemies (real or imaginary).

Other important researches are: the relations of adult to adolescent, child and infantile groups in respect of pacifist technique: pacifist substitutes for physical violence (flogging, etc.); e.g. psychic systems of inhibition and/or exhortation on the part of the adult or adult group: systems of expiation or restitution on the part of the child or infant).

III. ON PEACE

As peace phenomena comprise practically the whole territory of psychology and psychological anthropology, investigations must be concentrated in the first instance on important aspects, leaving more complete surveys till later. It has been suggested that an Interim Report should be drawn up at the end of fifty years: this condition might well apply to the systematization of peace phenomena. The most important lines of selected research can be arranged as under. To avoid repetition it may be taken for granted that in each case the research would need to be divided in accordance with material and method, i.e. Direct and Indirect Observation subdivided in accordance with the depth of the method of investigation, viz. conscious, preconscious and unconscious and the nature of the material, viz. infantile, pre-pubertal, adolescent and adult; and again, savage, barbaric or civilized.

SYSTEMATIC APPROACH

A. ON THE NATURE OF PRIMITIVE INSTINCT

- (I) The development and modification of primitive destructive impulse: individual and group aspects.
- (II) The development and modification of primitive sexual impulse: individual and group aspects.
- (III) The history of fusions of destructive and sexual impulse; e.g. sadism, masochism, etc.: individual and group aspects.

B. ON THE NATURE OF PRIMITIVE DEFENCE MECHANISMS

- (I) Projection: animism; destructive magic; infantile fear systems involving the external world: external enemies.
- (II) Introjection: immanence; demoniacal possession; infantile systems of inner persecution: primitive unconscious conscience: internal enemies.
- (III) Repression.
- (IV) Cathartic reactions: (a) Social: infant tantrums; adolescent and adult orgies; love, war and death ceremonials in the primitive adult; saturnalia; lynch-

ing; gangsterism: rioting. (*b*) Individual: hysteria, certain forms of insanity.

- (V) Self-punishment and expiatory mechanisms; self-injury, abasement, suicide, religious penance and flagellation.
- (VI) Punishment of others: blame, mental and physical discipline: flogging, torture, blood sports, murder; black magic in the primitive adult.
- (VII) Expiation by restitution: absolution through works of grace: (*a*) social: philanthropy, reform, white magic in the primitive: (*b*) individual: obsessional neurosis and certain character peculiarities.

C. ON THE NATURE OF PRIMITIVE EMOTIONAL STATES (AFFECT)

- (I) Tension affects (due to increased instinct excitation with or without actual frustration): e.g. anxiety, guilt, apprehension.
- (II) Mixed affects (due partly to tension, partly to inhibition of discharge and partly to discharge): e.g. irritability, anger, etc.
- (III) Discharge affects: e.g. anger, grief, depression. Application of conclusions

to specific problems: the relation of anxiety to fear, of anxiety and fear to guilt, of anxiety, guilt and fear to hate and aggression: war.

Application of these further conclusions to hostility reactions of groups (*a*) social forms, (*b*) war.

D. ON THE NATURE OF PRIMITIVE CHARACTER FORMATIONS: infantile and savage: the earliest organized defence systems acting as a buttress against aggressive and destructive impulse and providing common ground for reality relations with environment.

E. ON THE PRIMITIVE RELATIONS OF ENVIRONMENT TO THE INDIVIDUAL

- (I) The gratification of aggressive and destructive impulses by the adult on the infant, child, adolescent and adult respectively: (*a*) mental: blame, exhortation, threatening, withdrawal of love, excommunication, ostracism, etc., (*b*) physical: starving, beating (infant), flogging, imprisonment, torture, (children and adults), execution (adult).
- (II) The inhibition of infant aggressive im-

pulses by the adult: (*a*) by example: display of adult anxiety, (*b*) by the methods indicated in Section I (*a*) and (*b*).

- (III) The encouragement of infant aggressive impulses by the adult: (*a*) by example: display of adult aggression, (*b*) by precept, inculcation of principles of pugnacity, (*c*) by direct tuition.
- (IV) The gratification of primitive sexual impulse by the adult on the infant and child: seduction, etc.
- (V) The inhibition of infantile sexual impulse by the adult.
- (VI) The encouragement of infantile sexual impulse by the adult.

Conclusions drawn from above to be applied to specific problems, e.g. the influence of various parental and social policies on unconscious anxiety, guilt and hate, and on conscious hate and aggressiveness towards objects or groups: war.

F. ON THE NATURE AND FUNCTION OF 'PLAY': infantile, savage and adult: the possibility of influencing unconscious impulse and reaction through adult interference with spontaneous play: cradle games, nursery games, school games, sports, hobbies, etc. (These problems are closely

concerned with the unconscious mechanism of *sublimation*. Owing to considerations of space the mechanism of sublimation has not been described in this book. It is sufficient to say that sublimation has an important bearing on war problems. In the first place sublimation is concerned with the unconscious deflection in non-sexual directions of frustrated energy derived from primitive sexual impulse. In so far as these frustrated impulses constitute a psychic danger to the child and arouse anxiety followed by hate and aggression towards external objects, faulty or inadequate sublimation must be a factor in war-readiness. The second point is that the existence of highly charged unconscious aggressive impulse interferes with the equally unconscious processes of sublimation and therefore is both directly and indirectly a factor in war. The question of whether aggressive impulses can be sublimated is still *sub judice*. Aggressive impulses can be deflected or inhibited or held in suspension by love impulses: it is questionable if they are ever sublimated in the strict sense of the term. This subject alone requires prolonged research before even a fair generalization can be arrived at.)

SPECIAL PROBLEMS

In addition to these systematized researches, there are a number of sociological and anthropo-

logical peace problems which, although apparently self-contained, have a more or less direct bearing on war. These specialized researches are bound to overlap with the more general systematized researches described above. A certain amount of overlapping is however positively advantageous, and in any case the existing machinery of investigation is so well organized (Societies, Institutes, Leagues, etc.) that it would be in many cases a waste of energy not to use this machinery. In other cases there is no machinery of investigation and the material is so inaccessible that special organizations would have to be built up to enable research to begin.

A. CRIMINOLOGICAL RESEARCH

As a rule crime is regarded from a moral or sociological point of view, rarely as a psychological functional phenomenon. There are two particular aspects of criminology that concern the student of war and peace. First of all there is the purely individual aspect, the degree to which impulses towards criminal behaviour tend to run parallel to the impulses giving rise to war-mindedness. Perhaps more important is the function of crime in providing the average individual or social group with a vicarious outlet for unconscious guilt and self-punishment tendencies. It would be important

to establish just how far society unconsciously exploits the existence of a criminal element in its midst; how far under existing circumstances the stabilization of peace tendencies depends on the maintenance of a criminal class and a penal code. An interesting speculation is what effect the reduction of criminal activity would have on pacifist and warlike tendencies respectively assuming that no other environmental changes took place or were effected *pari passu*. Apart from a systematic investigation of criminology and penology, an interesting post-war research would be the exact appraisalment of alleged post-war waves of crime.

B. ANTHROPOLOGICAL RESEARCH

Apart from more systematic research there are many special problems relating to war which require anthropological handling. In particular the relation of projection of hate (animistic systems) to the social organization of different tribes and to their killing systems (individual and social) requires prolonged and detailed study 'in the field.' On the theoretical side, the question of primal origins (incest taboos, sadism, guilt and group solidarity) requires more vigorous and imaginative handling than it receives at present. Anthropology has to a large extent been dominated by the conscious, self-preservative aspects:

of sociology and needs to be injected with a more psychological tendency. Failing this new orientation, research will have to be suspended until a psychological branch of anthropology has been established and its members trained to use analytical methods of approach.

C. TEAM RESEARCH ON THE RELATION OF ANTHROPOLOGICAL DATA TO THE DATA OF INSANITY, NEUROSIS AND INFANTILE DEVELOPMENT RESPECTIVELY.

In particular the relation of hate to primitive social systems, to the incidence of neuroses and psychoses and to the infantile forms of madness. How far war is a composite product due to regression to these levels of development.

D. TEAM WORK ON THE EXPLOITATION OF INJURY SYSTEMS

The functional exploitation of interest in organic illness, accidents, injuries, mutilations, malformations, monstrosities, etc., as a means of immobilizing unconscious destructive impulses.

E. RESEARCH ON THE STRUCTURE AND FUNCTION OF GROUPS

Current phenomenological surveys which are mainly concerned with adult manifestations

should be wound up as soon as possible, and the energies of 'conscious' group psychologists diverted to the phenomena of child and adolescent groups. The psychologist of the 'unconscious' may be left in charge of the investigation of 'nursery' groups. The relations of individual to group psychology should be re-examined on an analytical basis. Here again research may have to be suspended until new scientific organizations or branches are built up.

F. RESEARCH ON THE POLITICAL ASPECTS OF GROUP FUNCTION

The only justification for singling out these problems from other group researches is that in official pacifist circles great importance is attached to the difficulties inherent in organization by nations. It is frequently argued that a principal cause of war lies in multiplicity of administrations arranged on a more or less arbitrary racial basis. It cannot be denied that nationalist organizations frequently flout economic common sense. And it is certainly true that in many cases the tendency to territorial aggrandizement promotes both Chauvinistic friction and irredentist enthusiasm. Powerful as at first sight these rational arguments appear, there is no doubt that they function to a large extent as dangerous rationalizations. Individual psychological investigation shows that

behind these reality relations lie some of the deepest infantile interests, e.g. a sexual (symbolic) valuation of the 'stranger,' 'foreigner,' 'black' or 'yellow' man. Although less easy to detect in the case of war between, say, two European nations of roughly the same colour and culture, they can be observed almost entirely undisguised in the case of 'colour' barriers. The only effective counter to racial war cries and 'race peril' propaganda is to investigate the unconscious psychological factors leading to territorial aggrandizement and at the same time to lay bare the deep individual (emotional) factors which induce a state of racial 'inflammability.'

G. RESEARCH ON THE EFFECT OF ENVIRONMENTAL (PSYCHIC) INHIBITORY SYSTEMS

As far as effect on infantile and child development is concerned, this matter is already *sub judice*. But complementary researches should be carried out by trained diagnosticians on the therapeutic effect on the adolescent and adult of religious, moral, ethical and conventional systems of inhibition. In this connection the possibility of deleterious effects should be carefully explored. An interesting collateral research would be on the variation at different periods of religious practice, both active and passive in regard to war.

H. ON THE THERAPEUTIC RELATION OF LOVE TO HATE AND GUILT RESPECTIVELY

The 'screening' and reassurance functions of love phenomena. (This factor might almost have been introduced as a special condition governing all research, viz. : that no love impulse towards an object can be taken at its face value until it can be shown to exist apart from a hate interest towards the same object. Witness, e.g., the fact that violent hysterical love invariably relates in part to unconscious hate or fear.)

I. ON THE RELATION OF SEXUAL ANTAGONISM TO WAR

This is only one of a series of typical problems. The importance of antagonism between generations has already been dealt with in detail in the systematic sections (inter-group hostility). Clearly the Abraham-Isaac *motif* is repeated in the situation of the Elder Statesmen sending the younger generations to war, 'sacrificing their sons,' etc. And here the factors of unconscious fear and sexual jealousy are a first consideration. This leads naturally to the problem of unconscious antagonism between the sexes. This is important not only because it represents an as yet unmeasured reservoir of hate in human relations, but because such antagonism can get outlet in war situations,

e.g. mothers sending their sons to war, wives their husbands, and sisters their brothers or betrothed.

J. ON THE 'SCREENING' FUNCTION OF ECONOMIC FACTORS IN WAR

Assuming that the economic factors are thoroughly worked out by trained economists, the problem of their influence on war conditions must be taken over by the psychologist. The main point to investigate here is the degree of 'screening' (cover, masking) afforded unconscious motivation by conscious preoccupation with reality and mainly self-preservative situations. A second problem is the degree to which unconscious factors interfere with (a) the accurate estimation of economic data and mechanisms (cf. the confusion and heat engendered in England by discussions of Free Trade/Protection issues), and (b) the application of data objectively arrived at. If economic factors promote war readiness, why not estimate these accurately and having estimated them proceed if possible to their elimination? In this connection the factors of psychic 'inertia,' psychological 'stupidity,' etc., require careful investigation.

K. ON THE DEPTH OF RATIONALIZATION SYSTEMS

Rationalization can justly be called the last line of *unconscious* defence. 'Conscious' rationaliza-

tion is not a good term: there are already in existence several equivalents (e.g. day-dreaming, phantastic lying, plain lying, prevarication, equivocation, doubt, discussion for discussion's sake, etc.) which distinguish conscious mechanisms. Pure rationalization is unconscious. It is essential to establish just how deeply this unconscious process extends. It is important because on an accurate estimation of its depth the success of all propagandist systems ultimately depends. For example, the success of a League of Nations Union meeting is seriously threatened by the working of several rationalizations, not the least of which is that a pacifist is necessarily pacific in reaction.

INVESTIGATION OF THE PRINCIPLES OF PREVENTION

These investigations fall naturally into three categories: an exploration of the advantages of war with a view to securing their elimination; an investigation of the barrier spontaneously erected between primitive impulse and end-behaviour with a view to substituting, if possible, an improved system or systems; and an investigation of *ad hoc* measures of inhibition (precautions).

I. EXPLORATION OF THE ADVANTAGES OF WAR

It has been laid down as a premiss that there are advantages to be gained in war situations. This claim is based not on the usual economic arguments (sociological, national, individual, etc.), but on the facts already ascertained as to primary and secondary psychic 'gains' which can be demonstrated in the most 'painful' neuroses and psychoses. The primary psychic gain in suicide is a case in point. To this basis of fact is added the essentially clinical hypothesis that war is a functional phenomenon, an end result of the conflict of forces involving a considerable amount of abreaction of earlier emotional experience as well as positive discharge of unconscious destructive, sexual and other instincts. The present investigation is not intended to establish this premiss, but to estimate the *amount* of gain. In this way rather naïve (i.e. one-sided) propaganda as to the moral and physical loss involved in war will be made much more balanced and therefore much more effective.

Here again some overlapping in research will be unavoidable. The first step in exploring advantages will be the *elimination of processes of rationalization*. This mechanism has already been dealt with in the section on Peace Research, but

it will require special re-examination in the present connection. The difficulty can be best exemplified by the case of penological controversy. Much bitter feeling can be aroused and confusion of counsel prevail owing to the reformist tendency to turn a blind eye to the 'gains' of a penological system or attitude. The 'heat' although in the long run an obstacle to reform (i.e. to more effective adaptation) is natural. It is easy to establish clinically that much of the violent antagonism to beating is due to the reformer's struggle with unconscious desires or needs to be beaten. This easily established fact does not, of course, weaken any reality arguments against beating any more than a hearty enthusiasm for the 'sound flogging' of others proves the case for corporal punishment. It only goes to show that in any investigation of effective adaptation, special pleaders should be asked to withdraw.

II. STUDY OF SPONTANEOUS BARRIERS OR MECHANISMS DEALING WITH PRIMITIVE IMPULSE

This involves a re-examination of the factors dealt with in the section on Peace Problems (p. 122). It should be conducted with one special problem in mind, viz.: whether those spontaneous defensive formations, which function

unconsciously throughout the life of every individual, can be reduced or eliminated (where they operate in favour of war) or be substituted by less dangerous forms or can be *copied* (where they operate against warlike behaviour, or reduce potentialities of war-readiness.) In regard to attempts to alter spontaneous methods it has been laid down (p. 104) that such attempts must be almost as radical as the primitive mechanisms they are intended to supplant. Only by the closest and most comprehensive study of the actual dynamic barriers to primitive gratification, by discovering what needs elimination and what requires imitation or reinforcement, is there the faintest hope of finding out what might be done to prevent war.

Apart from repression—which is essentially a flight reaction—and projection (see pp. 27–30) which is an emergency measure successful as a rule only in the case of small quantities of energy and only then with the assistance of repression, the main lines of defence consist either in inhibition or substitute gratification. But these are all methods of dealing with *existing* tension. It is easy to see that other ways of approach are possible. In fact we can subdivide the research in accordance with whether we are concerned with the *accumulation* of tension, with its *inhibition* or *suspension*, and thirdly, with its *discharge*.

A. ON PREVENTING THE ACCUMULATION OF PRIMITIVE INSTINCT TENSION

It has been shown (p. 25) that the factor of anxiety is itself sufficient not only to bring about the frustration of instinct but to stimulate aggressive impulse. Here we have a focal research on the problem of accumulation. Eliminate (if that is possible) some anxiety reactions, and you will certainly reduce the accumulation of tension and therefore reduce hostility reactions. Find out therefore which types of anxiety are capable of elimination and formulate experiments along these lines.

B. ON MODES OF INHIBITING OR COUNTERACTING EXISTING STATES OF PRIMITIVE TENSION

Here there are two main lines of approach:—

- (1) Unconscious systems of inhibition (a) without disturbance of the processes of reflection, (b) affecting also the processes of reflection. From the point of view of safety any processes interfering with reflection prevent the interpolation of an adequate *period of delay* in discharge of instinct tension. On the other hand, processes of reflection can be spun out in an excessive (obsessional) manner. This may be as dangerous as the short-circuiting of reflection, cf. disarmament conferences ending in panic and policies of increased armament.

- (2) Exploitation of love systems in order to hold primitive instinct in check or to make good the imaginary crimes of unconscious sadism.

Of these two systems the second is perhaps the less risky, but it involves excessive expenditure of psychic energy and brings about a good deal of personal unhappiness. Nevertheless, there is ample scope for the experimental application of orderly principles of environmental influence provided all the factors in the situation are converted into conscious factors.

C. ON MODES OF DISCHARGING PRIMITIVE TENSION

- (1) *Primal discharge* (mostly impossible, dangerous where possible owing to retaliation or threat of retaliation from environment).
- (2) Discharge by *part-projection* (possible in emergency, dangerous in excess because it distorts external reality).
- (3) Discharge by *internalization* (possible: dangerous in excess, because it distorts reality feeling).
- (4) Discharge by *displacement*
 - (a) to secondary objects, the aim of the impulse remaining unchanged: e.g. a child killing a fly instead of attempting to kill its mother; an adult breaking

coals instead of breaking heads or destroying an opponent's argument instead of destroying his body (useful when displacement certain: dangerous because the *aim* of the instinct is unaltered):

- (b) displacement to secondary objects combined with alteration of the *aim* of the impulse: the classical mechanism of *sublimation*: applies so far only to primitive sexual impulse and to the sexual components of sadism: unconscious in operation: e.g. infant clambering up a ladder or child climbing a tree instead of attempting an infantile seduction of its mother or nurse: adult attempting to climb Mount Everest. One of the safest of unconscious mechanisms because the *aim* is altered, but can of course regress. Difficulty in application: that it is an unconscious not a conscious process like child guidance.

(It may have been remarked that, throughout, no mention has been made of education, pedagogy, etc. The reason may be stated here, viz.: that education is in essence an artificial expedient or experiment initiated by environment ostensibly

to promote reality adaptation, but unconsciously to influence the mechanism of displacement in certain directions. Education has also (at present at any rate) much in common with inhibition but these aspects are usually glossed over by emphasizing displacement mechanisms. It follows that the influence of formal education on peace or pacifism cannot be accurately estimated until the exact range of displacement and of other unconscious mechanisms has been estimated.)

(5) COMPLEX MECHANISMS FOR DISCHARGE OF
PRIMITIVE INSTINCT

The scope of this research can best be indicated by considering the phenomenon of *wit* discharge. The characteristic of wit is that it combines a number of unconscious and a few preconscious mechanisms. The result of this combination is that some primitive tensions obtain explosive discharge. But the discharge under ordinary circumstances does not injure the onlookers although it may sometimes hurt (psychically injure) any immediate object of the wit tendency (victim). And as a rule, obscene wit apart, the discharge is not out of harmony with the individual's code of behaviour.

(Assuming that all these and many other supplementary researches are carried to a conclusion, the successful application of results in

the form of experiments depends on the degree to which an accurate perspective can be gained of the *total function of a primitive instinct barrier.*)

III. INVESTIGATION OF THE VALUE OF AD HOC PREVENTIVE EXPERIMENTS

This is a branch of research which could be expanded indefinitely and might run away with a good deal of valuable energy. A condition for initiating research should be that the method in question seems capable of practical application. Illustrative problems: to investigate the advisability of submitting politicians, diplomats and civil servants of high administrative rank to a psychological examination. Already diplomats and civil servants are compelled to submit to an examination of certain of their intellectual faculties and faculties of memory. The new examination would be aimed at discovering those individuals whose psychic and emotional make-up renders them 'suspect' or 'dangerous' from the point of view of concealed war reactions. As a preliminary to establishing reliable diagnostic criteria, many investigations of 'random samples' would have to be carried out. This would apply in the first case to true unselected samples but it would be useful to apply the sampling system to special

groups, e.g. lawyers, members of parliament, political agents, newspaper proprietors, the administrative staff in employers' associations and labour unions, schoolmasters, and so forth. Yet another precautionary measure would be essential, viz.: an examination of sample groups of psychologists. It should be a prerequisite of all research that the investigators are themselves investigated. (Interestingly enough pure psycho-analysis is the only science which attempts to control error along these more personal lines. It is a hard and fast rule of training Institutes in all countries that no one should do consultative or therapeutic work in psycho-analysis until he has himself been analysed. This is a measure that at least Secretaries of State for Foreign Affairs might be requested to observe before embarking on political investigation and diplomatic therapy. But if for the moment it appears to be unduly stringent, there is no reason why lesser expedients should not become routine practice, e.g. a diagnostic examination of governing executives for pathological character traits.)

INDEX

Abreaction, 115, 135

Action—

‘practical,’ 79

‘psychic,’ 81

Advantages, war, 49, 113,
135

Affects, 22, 111, 123

Aggression, impulses of, 13,
19, 124, 126

Ambivalence, 99

Animism, 28, 32, 122

Antagonism, sexual, 132

Anxiety, 25, 26, 97, 126,
138

ASQUITH, 21

BETHMANN-HOLLWEG, 21

Blackmail, psychic, 97, 99

BOTTOMLEY, HORATIO, 37

Ceremonials, war, 122

Children, nursery activities
of, 13

Civilisation, 30, 49, 70, 72

Combatants, investigation
of, 117

Conflict, 45, 135
externalisation of, 29
infantile, 37
internal, 66
mental, 15, 88
unconscious, 109

Conscience, Unconscious,
33, 65, 122

Conscientious objectors, 63

Crime, 127

Cruelty, 96, 197

Defence-mechanisms, 43, 75,
122

Destructive—

criticism, 73

impulses, 15, 19, 75, 122

Development, neurotic
phases of, 91

Disarmament, 86, 91, 92,
138

Displacement, 27, 139

Education, 140

Ego, primitive, 34, 65

Enemy, inner and/or ex-
ternal, 27, 66, 119, 122

Environment, 83, 95, 96,
124

Experiment(s), 98, 101, 103,
114, 142

Expiation, 70, 123

Exploration, mental, 80

Frustration, 26, 31, 58, 102

Fusion of impulses, 20, 56,
122

Gains, psychic, 135

‘Good form,’ psychological,
108

- Gratification—
 sexual, 52, 125
 substitute, 137
 GREY, SIR EDWARD, 21, 36, 40
 Group—
 instincts, 14
 impulses, 37
 Guilt, 25, 70, 132
 unconscious, 57, 59, 71, 76, 127
 Hate, 25, 26, 31, 32, 129
 and love, 31, 71, 99, 132
 Head-hunting, 28
 Herd-instinct, 37
 Homosexuality, sublimated, 29
 Hostility, 25, 118, 132
 Hypnosis, 94, 116
 Hysteria, 80, 123
 Identifications, 32, 33, 58
 Imagination, 111
 Impotence, 108
 Impulses, classification of, 14, 37
 Incest barrier, 71
 Infantile Family Group, 68
 Inhibition, 33, 42, 124, 131, 132, 137, 138
 Insanity, 15, 46, 93, 123, 129
 Instincts—
 classification of, 15
 primitive, nature of, 122
 Introjection, 122
 KAISER, the, 36
 League of Nations, 11, 16, 40, 48, 84
 Union, 81, 134
 Love—
 impulses, 126
 therapeutic relations of, 132
 Magic, 74, 122
 Masochism, 20, 44, 52, 122
 erotogenic, 55
 moral, 67
 primary, 56
 secondary, 57
 unconscious, 64, 69, 72
 Melancholia, 65
 Mental mechanisms, 27, 104
 Methods of research, 116
 MONTAGUE, C. E., 39
 Nationalism, 29
 Neuroses, 15, 80, 109
 Neurotic disorder, theories of, 89
 Pacifism—
 adolescent, 120
 adult, 119
 child, 120
 data on, 119
 infantile, 120
 Pacifist—
 problem of, 60
 technique, 120
 Parents—
 function of, 95
 primitive attitudes of, 98

- Peace—
 activities, instability in,
 13
 data on, 121
 fanatic, 40
 preparedness, 78
 propaganda, 11, 14, 21,
 34, 45, 75
 Perversions, 18, 52
 Play, 94, 125
 POINCARÉ, 36
 Policies, parental, 97, 105
 Pop-gun problem, 86
 controversy, 90
 Prevention, war, 39, 134
 Projection, 27, 29, 32, 58,
 104, 122, 137
 Psycho-analysis, 55, 78, 106,
 143
 Psychology—
 child, 26
 clinical, 112
 comparative, 26
 conscious, 52
 experimental, 112
 group, 11, 130
 individual, application to
 group manifestations,
 37, 60
 medical, 45
 unconscious, 47
 Punishment, 44, 97
 'need for,' 57, 59
 self-, 52, 57, 123, 127

 Rationalization, 44, 133,
 135
- Reaction formation, in
 peace, 115
 Reactions, cathartic, 122
 Recruit, civilian, 61
 Repression, 22, 24, 25, 30,
 104, 122, 137
 Research, 16, 98, 105, 112
 anthropological, 128
 criminological, 127
 on Pacifism, 119
 on Peace, 121
 on War, 113
 Restitution, 123

 Sadism, 20, 33, 36, 44, 59,
 75, 122
 erotogenic, 56
 impulses, 43
 primary, 56
 primitive, 24, 48
 unconscious, 46, 51, 71
 Sado-masochism, 56, 70, 103
 Sanctions, 42, 102
 Self-injury, 51. *See* 'Punish-
 ment'
 Self-preservative impulse(s),
 15, 17, 50, 54, 69
 Sexual impulse(s), 15, 102,
 122, 125
 SHAW, 110
 Soldier(s)—
 experiences of, 17
 'private,' problem of, 17,
 60
 reactions of, 13, 36
 Star Chamber, nursling's, 97
 Sublimation, 126, 140

Suggestion, 94, 116
 Suicide, 53, 65, 123, 135
 Super-ego, 33, 65

 Tantrums, 26, 122
 Tension, 22, 59, 68, 75, 123,
 137-139
 Thousand Years Plan, 109
 Trophy—
 -hunting, 17
 -worship, 42
 Tyranny, psychic, 97

 Unconscious, the, 37, 47, 57,
 105
 Understanding, 80

 War, 44, 45, 66, 79, 91, 105,
 135

War, abolition of, 12, 43,
 113
 adolescent, 117
 adult, 116
 child, 118
 data on, 116
 impulses, 15, 16
 infantile, 118
 -mindedness, 99, 108, 127
 -mongering, 24
 nursery, 28
 readiness, 123, 133
 Research Board, 113
 responsibility, 38, 50
 tribal, 28
 and Pacifism, 59, 99, 106
 and Peace, 13, 14, 19, 75,
 92, 105, 114
 Wit, 141

